SD
Part B

FFY2015
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

150

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

South Dakota has a variety of ways to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met.

South Dakota's general supervision encompasses a review of local education agency (LEA) special education programs on a four year cycle. The review incorporates an analysis of compliance through State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators, state assessment accommodation verification, dispute resolution follow-up, and fiscal reviews.

South Dakota's review cycle distributes LEAs and educational agencies over a four year period. Each LEA review includes a review of LEA child count data in comparison to state level reporting, Indicator 13 data collection, one-on-one teacher file reviews, verification of certification and highly qualified status of special education staff, and a representative file review across disability categories and age levels. If relevant to the LEA, a review may also include a review of private school eligibility and service plans, program purchases, extraordinary cost fund program file reviews, and other relevant areas.

LEAs may receive an on-site or off-site focused review. Focused reviews are generally related to a corrective action received from a complaint or due process. Monitoring team leaders review specific areas which were related to the issue in the complaint or due process hearing to verify continued correction. If the LEA's performance on a SPP compliance indicator is low, then a focused review will occur to determine if there is a systemic issue related to the low performance.

If non-compliance has been identified, a finding in the form of a written notification including the specific non-compliance, the citation of the statue or regulation and/or the data supporting the conclusion is issued by Special Education Programs (SEP). The LEA will correct all areas of non-compliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year of the written notification by submitting supporting documentation for the correction of each individual case identified (Prong 1) as well as documentation of correction of the regulatory requirements (Prong 2) as required by the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Part of the corrective action may include targeted technical assistance overseen by SEP. Correction and compliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum is verified by SEP.

Fiscal monitoring includes the review and approval of the application LEAs submit to the Department of Education (DOE) to apply for IDEA 611 and 619 funds. SEP reviews the application to ensure it meets program requirements. Once approved by SEP, the Grants Management Office reviews the application to ensure the budget and program costs are aligned and allowable. Grants Management also verifies that the LEA has met Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements. Grants Management reviews the application a final time before approval.

When the DOE conducts a fiscal review of the IDEA 611 and 619 funds, the LEA submits their accounting records. Grants Management compares accounting records with reimbursement requests and the grant application for the IDEA Part B 611, IDEA Part B 619, coordinated early intervening services (CEIS), and Private Schools. The following are reviewed:

- The DOE ensures, if the LEA utilized CEIS funds up to 15%, the funds are provided to non-identified students (not on an IEP) through fiscal review and special education monitoring review. The LEA separately tracks and accounts for IDEA funds used for CEIS in the accounting software.
- MOE is reviewed and a determination is made as to whether the LEA is in compliance or if MOE needs to be addressed.
- If the LEA has a private school, the DOE verifies the public LEA expended the required proportionate share indicated on the federal IDEA budget. If the LEA purchased equipment, the DOE verifies if it was an appropriate expenditure and the LEA maintained control over all IDEA funds, property, equipment, and supplies at the private school. Also, the DOE determines if the LEA used private school personnel to provide equitable services, services were performed outside of the regular duty hours and under the supervision of the public agency. Lastly, the DOE determines how the LEA identifies the private school expenses in their financial software.

The DOE does a fiscal cross-cutting and ensures the LEA is supplementing not supplanting their federal funds. DOE will check if the LEA generated any program income and checks time and effort documentation against the general ledger. If the LEA purchased equipment with federal funds, the DOE requests the property records and ensures that the equipment is reasonable and necessary to implement the IEP. During onsite monitoring, SEP confirms the item purchased has been appropriately labeled and inventoried according to the program requirements. The DOE identifies if there are adequate controls in place to ensure safeguarding and maintaining equipment (including a physical inventory reconciled at least every other year). The DOE verifies procurements are in place and if necessary collects documentation supporting vendor selection. If there are third party contractors, the DOE checks to see they are approved and monitored by the LEA.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

SEP provides technical assistance to LEAs utilizing different methods to reach as many constituents as possible in the manner that best meets their needs.

Technical Assistance documents are developed to help clarify policies and procedures to ensure LEAs are able to implement the IDEA and state requirements. The documents are posted on the SEP webpage, shared with constituents at conferences and webinars and notices of availability are sent on the special education listserv. Monthly Special Education Director Webinars are held and recorded and posted for later reference to discuss upcoming data collections, provide TA on areas that have been identified through monitoring or complaints, and to provide updates on policies. SEP keeps open lines of communication with the LEAs through topical listservs and by assigning region representatives to ensure all constituents are able to access prompt, high quality technical support.

In order to provide topical and in-depth assistance, SEP utilizes contracted specialists, including but not limited to:

- Education Specialists are contracted through educational cooperatives to conduct on-site monitoring reviews. They also conduct regional trainings around Individual Education Plans and High School Transition for teachers, present at teacher preparation programs, and conduct trainings related to corrective action plans.
- State Performance Plan Coordinators were created in July 2014. They provide direct technical assistance to districts in understanding, collecting, and reviewing State Performance Plan data to improve programming. They are regionally located in order to provide direct connections and assistance with districts.
- The Transition Services Liaison Project (TSLP) focuses on high school transition. They are a collaborative partnership between the DOE and Department of Human Services, Division of Rehabilitation Services. TSLP staff are regionally located. They make one-on-one connections with high school special education teachers and personnel. They assist by providing technical assistance in writing compliant Individual Education Plans (IEP), assist in locating resources for evidence based practices, and link adult agencies with LEA personnel, students and families.
- Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Coordinators work directly with LEAs to implement a continuous-improvement framework in which data-based problem solving and decision making are practiced across all levels of the educational system for supporting students. The coordinators are trained in Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) processes.
- Educational cooperatives and the Center for Disabilities provide specialized training and technical assistance in regional areas and on areas of statewide need identified through monitoring and LEA input.
- The Navigator Program is contracted through South Dakota Parent Connections. The Navigator Program staff serves as an objective and neutral party which assists parents and school personnel to locate and utilize information, improve communication, build or re-build partnerships and make progress towards agreement.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Professional development is provided in a variety of ways due to South Dakota's large area and rural nature. South Dakota has 77,121 square miles and of the 150 LEAs, 33 have enrollment of less than 200, 77 LEAs have enrollment between 201 and 600, and 40 LEAs have enrollment of 600 plus. State, regional and webinar trainings allow LEA staff to have access to appropriate professional development. Contractors are hired to provide direct technical assistance in the LEA. SEP professional development revolves around data collection, IEP process, behavior, response to intervention, instructional coaching and other pertinent areas identified through monitoring, LEA input, and input from the stakeholder groups including the South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities and the Parent Training and Information Center.

IEP process workshops are held every fall across South Dakota. Approximately 20 IEP workshops are held annually for new special education teachers. IEP workshops cover the process from referral, evaluation, eligibility to IEP development. Several scenarios are presented related to issues that state data has shown as an area of need. This year a pilot High School IEP and Transition Workshop was held in Rapid City, SD and Sioux Falls, SD to address procedures for students turning 16. Previously the IEP and Transition workshops were held separately and teachers often had to choose which one to attend.

A Special Education newsletter is distributed each month on the listserv and posted to the web. The newsletter includes SEP highlights, federal updates, the agenda for the monthly Special Education Director Webinar, and features on a general and Special Education program area. The newsletter includes professional development opportunities available for teachers and administrators. A Special Education Director Webinar is held every third Tuesday of the month and is recorded for viewing later at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/speddirectors.aspx. The webinars inform special education directors and other interested parties about information and changes at the federal and state level, initiatives, data collection, and other DOE information.

SEP partners with The Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to offer webinar trainings on specialized topics and the recordings are placed on the web. Examples of topics include prior written notice, transportation, surrogate parents, Who is the Parent?, accommodations, legal updates and discipline.

Face to Face trainings occur regionally around the state. Trainings span a variety of topics, including but not limited to discipline, early childhood, writing effective behavior plans, writing standards based IEPs, facilitation of IEP meetings, transition training, parental engagement and connecting with youth, and instructional strategies.

SEP sponsors speakers at conferences of partnering organizations, focusing on meeting the needs of students with disabilities including the Youth Leadership Forum, Early Childhood conference, and SD Speech and Language Pathologist Association conference. SEP hosts two major conferences each year, one targets special education professionals and one targets general education professionals with a focus on making learning accessible for all students.

Entities, such as the Center for Disabilities and the Augmentative and Alternative Communication Workgroup, conduct technical assistance through Skype, Facetime, and other avenues in order to provide more frequent and timely feedback to individuals after face to face trainings or for targeted technical assistance.

By utilizing a diverse range of technical assistance delivery methods and platforms, SEP ensures access to timely and high quality professional development for all stakeholders.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☐ apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

SEP selects broad stakeholder representation across South Dakota. Stakeholder groups include cross department representation as well as representation from special education administrators, superintendents and building principals. Teachers, both general and special education are included in stakeholder groups. Parent Connection staff, professors, parents, educational cooperative staff, advisory panel members and contractors are also included on stakeholder teams. SEP ensures a representative sample across the state including different geographic areas and LEA enrollment size in order to adequately represent the diversity in South Dakota.

SEP staff collaborates across departments throughout the DOE. All nine staff are integrated and assist other offices in the implementation of regulations and strategies to improve results. DOE participates in cross stakeholder meetings, DOE Strategic Planning, and other projects. As the SPP Indicators are updated, SEP staff bring internal knowledge of the other initiatives and regulations along with inviting other offices to sit at the table or obtain input throughout the updating of the SPP activities.

Once the stakeholder group has made recommendations, the activities and proposed decisions are shared with the South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities and on Special Education Director Webinars for additional input. The Special Education Director Webinars have approximately 60 live participants and many listen to the recording located on the SEP website.

Stakeholder groups met related to the SPP/APR and SSIP on June 13 and October 18, 2016. Input was sought from the South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities at the January 9, 2017 meeting.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

Following the submission of the SPP and APR to the U.S. Department of Education, SEP will disseminate the SPP and APR, and LEA information in the following ways:

- Post the final version and SPP, APR, LEA information and 618 tables on the agency website at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped-SPP.aspx
- Public Notices in the five (5) major South Dakota newspapers notifying the public of the website http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped-SPP.aspx where the SPP and APR can be accessed. Hard copies of the reports will be available upon request. Newspapers printing the public notices are as follows: the Sioux Falls *Argus Leader*, the Huron *Plainsman*, the Pierre *Capital Journal* and the *Rapid City Journal*.

The SEA disseminates the information by:

- Alerting constituency groups via existing listservs, email and workshops.
- Presentations through Live Meeting will be held in February and April 2017 to present the FFY 2015 APR.
- South Dakota Parent Connection will announce publication of the SPP and APR on the SEP website in their newsletter and weekly update so parents know how to access it.
- Electronic copies will be available to all South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities members.
- Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, hard copy, or digital) on request to the South Dakota Department of Education, Special Education Programs at:

South Dakota Department of Education
Attn: Special Education Programs
800 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501-2294

SEP will be publicly reporting at the LEA level on the required indicators no later than May 30, 2017. Public reporting information on the State 618 data tables will also be available for those federal data tables that have been released. Access of this information can be found on the SEP website at the following link: http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped-SPP.aspx.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			81.00%	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	80.00%	81.50%	83.00%	84.50%
Data		82.60%	79.40%	82.45%	82.16%	82.16%	85.52%	64.23%	63.80%	59.67%	59.35%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☐ Yellow – Baseline ☐ Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	465	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	776	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	59.92%	Calculate ☐

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
465	776	59.35%	85.00%	59.92%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

South Dakota has one diploma. The minimum requirements for receiving a diploma are established by SDCL 13-33-19.

A Personal Learning Plan is required for every student in grades 9 through 12 and each student's plan must document a minimum of 22 credits that include the following:

1) Four units of Language Arts – must include:

a. Writing – 1.5 units

b. Literature – 1.5 units (must include .5 unit of American Literature)

c. Speech or Debate – .5 unit

d. Language Arts elective – .5 unit

2) Three units of Mathematics – must include:

a. Algebra I – 1 unit

b. *Algebra II – 1 unit

c. *Geometry – 1 unit

3) Three units of Lab Science – must include:

a. Biology – 1 unit

b. Any Physical Science – 1 unit

c. *Chemistry or Physics – 1 unit

4) Three units of Social Studies – must include:

a. U.S. History – 1 unit

b. U.S. Government – .5 unit

c. World History – .5 unit

d. Geography – .5 unit

5) One unit of the following-any combination:

a. Approved Career & Technical Education

b. Capstone Experience or Service Learning

c. World Language

6) One unit of Fine Arts

7) One-half unit of Personal Finance or Economics

8) One-half unit of Physical Education

9) One-half unit of Health or Health Integration

Academic core content credit may be earned by completing an approved career and technical education course. Approval to offer credit must be obtained through an application process with the Department of Education. The application must include: course syllabus; standards based curriculum; teacher certification; and assessment of standards by methods including end-of-course exams, authentic assessment, project-based learning or rubrics.

With school and parent/guardian approval, a student may be excused from this course in favor of a more appropriate course. A student may be excused from Algebra II or Geometry, but not both. A student is still required to take three units of Math. If a student is excused from Chemistry or Physics, the student must still take three units of Lab Science.

With regards to the health requirement: Beginning with students who are freshmen in the fall of 2013, students will be required to take .5 unit of health at any time grades 6-12. A LEA may choose to integrate health across the curriculum at the middle or high school level in lieu of a stand-alone course.

Local decision: A LEA may decide to offer credit for extracurricular Fine Arts activities. Students may be granted up to one credit in Fine Arts for participation in extracurricular activities. A maximum of ¼ credit may be granted for each activity in each school year.

The IEP team has the authority to modify the specific credits required for graduation. The IEP team must take into consideration the student's postsecondary goals along with the nature of the student's disability, which prevents the student from accessing the same curriculum with accommodations and supports.

☑ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

DOE has updated the data collection process to differentiate students on an IEP that have graduated with a diploma and met the same requirements as all students between those that have had their course requirements modified by the IEP team.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.80%	4.70%	3.31%	3.31%	3.21%	3.21%	3.11%	3.00%	2.90%
Data		3.90%	4.07%	4.53%	1.89%	3.31%	1.76%	1.74%	2.22%	2.53%	2.76%

Key: ▢ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ▢ Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.90%	2.80%	2.50%	2.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of youth ages 14-21 on December 1 child count	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
142	4,690	2.76%	2.90%	3.03%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

☐ Change numerator description in data table
☑ Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Total number of students ages 14-21 who Dropped Out or Moved Not Known to Continue divided by the total number of student 14-21 on the December 1 Child Count multiplied by 100.

142/4690 X 100 = 3.03%

Explanation of Slippage

During the 2014-15 school year, South Dakota had two LEAs with significant increases in their dropout rates, this caused the statewide dropout rate to increase.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
- B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
- C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

This indicator is not applicable.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

    A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
    B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
    C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.20%	98.70%	99.20%	99.20%	99.30%	99.30%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
			Data		99.10%	99.43%	99.50%	99.30%	99.50%	99.70%	99.57%	99.57%	99.08%	99.19%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.40%	98.80%	99.20%	99.20%	99.30%	99.30%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
			Data		99.17%	99.50%	99.56%	99.37%	99.55%	99.69%	99.56%	99.56%	98.96%	99.21%

Key: ▢ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ▢ Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
Math	A ≥ Overall	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	11,073	10,988	99.19%	99.40%	99.23%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	11,072	10,974	99.21%	99.40%	99.11%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

This is the link to the state's report card information: http://doe.sd.gov/reportcard/

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

    A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
    B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
    C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥									47.20%	47.50%	
			Data								42.40%	40.96%	0%	18.86%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥									46.99%	47.65%	
			Data								42.17%	38.72%	0%	18.01%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	25.85%	32.59%	39.33%	46.07%
Math	A ≥ Overall	25.06%	31.87%	38.86%	45.49%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The AMO targets were reset late in the process for FFY2014 (after the February submission). In being allowed to use FFY2014 as the baseline, progress/slippage can be reported according to the target for FFY2015.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Update for FFY 2015: SEP met with stakeholder groups to reset targets with new baseline data for Indicator 3C. When SEP submitted the FFY 2014 SPP, the DOE had not yet reset AMOs based on the new state assessment. SEP indicated in the SPP that new AMOs would be looked at and that targets would be reset in the future. The stakeholder groups determined to continue to use the state AMOs as targets. Because the AMOs, although reset late, were applied to the FFY 2014 data, SEP will set new targets and make the FFY 2014 year the new baseline. The FFY 2015 data will be able to report progress/slippage to the target, instead of being the new baseline.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	10,988	2,247	18.86%	25.85%	20.45%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	10,974	2,112	18.01%	25.06%	19.25%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This is the link to the state's report card: http://doe.sd.gov/reportcard/

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

    A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

    B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.80%	1.20%	1.20%	0.60%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%
Data		0.60%	0.60%	0%	0%	0%	0.64%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

◯ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	150	0%	1.30%	0.67%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

◉ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

◯ The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for Part A means more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. South Dakota chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the South Dakota Department of Education does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

IEP students suspended or expelled at the LEA >than 10 days in a school year

÷

Child Count at the LEA X 100 = %

Significant Discrepancy: If greater than 5% of the LEA child count population have been suspended for >10 days

☑ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Of the 151 districts, four districts suspended at least 10 students. Only one district met the state definition of significant disproportionality. There were 15 districts excluded because their suspension/expulsion rate had at least one student suspended/expelled but fewer than 10 students suspended/expelled for

more than 10 days. The other 131 districts did not suspend any students for 10 or more days.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)
Description of review

19 LEAs reported suspending one or more students for greater than ten days. Of these LEAs one met the minimum n-size for removals and was required to have a review of policies, procedures, and practices. The LEA had a total of 20 students suspended for greater than ten days. Of those 20 students, ten were removed to an interim alternative educational setting for drugs and three were removed for weapons violations.

- ● The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

- ○ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

  - ○ The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

    Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

  - ● The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

    A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

    B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

◯ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	0	150	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for 4B means more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities by race/ethnicity at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. South Dakota chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the South Dakota Department of Education does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

IEP students per race and ethnic group suspended or expelled at the LEA > than 10 days in a school year

÷

Child Count at the LEA X 100 = %

Significant Discrepancy: If greater than 5% of the LEA child count population by race have been suspended for >10 days

☑ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Of the 151 districts, only one district suspended at least 10 students in any given race/ethnicity category. This district met the state definition of significant disproportionality but had appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place. There were 18 districts excluded because their suspension/expulsion rate had at least one student suspended/expelled but fewer than 10 students suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in any given race/ethnicity category. The other 131 districts did not suspend any students for 10 or more days.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)
Description of review

A meeting was held with the LEA Special Education Director to discuss the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices. The policies, procedures, and practices for the 2014-2015 school year were found to be in compliance at that time. Ten of the twenty suspensions for greater than ten days were due to drugs and three were for weapons violations. Of the remaining seven suspensions, the student's behavior plans had been followed prior to the suspension and steps were taken to rewrite the behavior plans when necessary.

⦿ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

○ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. **Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
- B. **Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
- C. **In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.50%
		Data		65.00%	65.65%	67.60%	66.14%	68.45%	67.74%	69.23%	69.53%	67.84%	68.44%
B	2005	Target ≤			7.00%	6.50%	6.00%	6.50%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
		Data		6.50%	6.73%	5.96%	5.35%	5.34%	5.12%	5.20%	5.42%	5.37%	5.54%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.30%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	3.80%	3.80%	3.80%	3.80%	3.69%
		Data		3.30%	3.15%	3.06%	4.00%	4.04%	3.79%	2.99%	2.20%	2.29%	2.11%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	67.00%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%
Target B ≤	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
Target C ≤	3.59%	3.49%	3.39%	3.29%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	16,900	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	11,696	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	954	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	150	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	203	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	18	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6	11,696	16,900	68.44%	67.00%	69.21%

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day					
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	954	16,900	5.54%	6.00%	5.64%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	371	16,900	2.11%	3.59%	2.20%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									21.45%	21.45%	21.45%
		Data								20.94%	24.20%	21.03%	20.19%
B	2011	Target ≤									16.26%	16.26%	16.26%
		Data								16.76%	14.08%	15.40%	15.59%

Key:　□ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline　□ Yellow – Baseline　Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	21.45%	21.45%	21.55%	21.65%
Target B ≤	16.26%	16.26%	16.16%	16.16%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	2,627	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	588	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	346	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	11	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	588	2,627	20.19%	21.45%	22.38%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	361	2,627	15.59%	16.26%	13.74%

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

    A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
    B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
    C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						78.05%	78.55%	78.65%	79.15%	79.15%	79.15%
		Data					78.10%	79.78%	73.65%	71.43%	81.04%	74.67%	75.50%
A2	2008	Target ≥						84.00%	84.05%	84.10%	84.15%	84.15%	84.15%
		Data					84.00%	84.04%	86.80%	82.18%	85.84%	84.48%	85.93%
B1	2008	Target ≥						69.41%	64.39%	64.49%	64.99%	64.50%	65.50%
		Data					69.40%	64.29%	69.79%	70.02%	71.33%	68.92%	66.73%
B2	2008	Target ≥						54.86%	55.36%	55.46%	55.96%	55.96%	55.96%
		Data					54.90%	57.31%	61.80%	56.22%	65.17%	64.21%	62.17%
C1	2008	Target ≥						71.16%	66.50%	66.60%	67.10%	67.10%	68.10%
		Data					71.20%	66.40%	68.00%	65.11%	70.65%	68.29%	71.27%
C2	2008	Target ≥						71.05%	71.55%	71.60%	72.10%	72.10%	72.10%
		Data					11.00%	72.12%	73.60%	69.89%	76.88%	74.34%	76.95%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	79.15%	79.15%	79.25%	79.35%
Target A2 ≥	84.15%	84.15%	84.25%	84.35%
Target B1 ≥	66.50%	67.50%	68.50%	69.50%
Target B2 ≥	55.96%	55.96%	56.96%	57.96%
Target C1 ≥	69.10%	70.10%	71.10%	71.60%
Target C2 ≥	72.10%	72.10%	72.60%	73.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	780.00

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	56.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	64.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	112.00	

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	548.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	176.00	232.00	75.50%	79.15%	75.86%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	660.00	780.00	85.93%	84.15%	84.62%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	177.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	164.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	193.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	246.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	357.00	534.00	66.73%	66.50%	66.85%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	439.00	780.00	62.17%	55.96%	56.28%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	105.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	102.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	141.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	432.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	243.00	348.00	71.27%	69.10%	69.83%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	573.00	780.00	76.95%	72.10%	73.46%

Was sampling used?   No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)?   No
Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

South Dakota defined "comparable to same-age peers" as any child who received a standard score of -1.27 or above the norm on the BDI2 scoring chart. This corresponds to the 10th percentile rank on the BDI-2 for a given outcome area.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			62.70%	63.20%	63.70%	64.20%	65.20%	67.20%	69.20%	77.30%	77.30%
Data		62.20%	75.30%	79.20%	81.60%	84.20%	84.50%	85.60%	77.30%	83.85%	83.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4903.00	5813.00	83.49%	77.50%	84.35%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Parents of all students with disabilities ages 3-21 are given an opportunity to complete the survey. As in previous years, in FFY 2015, the survey was given to parents at the annual IEP meeting, parent-teacher conferences, and community dinners; it could also be sent via mail or completed online. This personalized distribution method ensured all parents received the survey; furthermore, school staff members personally encouraged the parents to complete the survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children reported on the parent survey and the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the size of the LEA where the child attends school; (3) by the race/ethnicity of the child; and (4) by the grade level of the child. For example, 73% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children are white; and 17% of parents who returned a survey indicated that their children are Native American. Another example, 11% of the parents who returned a survey are a parent of a preschool child. An additional example, 32% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their child has a specific learning disability.

Was sampling used?   No

Was a collection tool used?   Yes
Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0.60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

○ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	150	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

South Dakota collects data for Indicator 9 through the state December 1 child count and Fall Enrollment collected on the last Friday in September. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA is calculated; thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 9, all of South Dakota's 150 public school LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 150 LEAs, 30 met the minimum n-size requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group). Please note that many LEAs in South Dakota have fewer than five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent SEP from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0.60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

◯ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	150	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

South Dakota collects data for Indicator 10 through the state December 1 child count and Fall Enrollment collected on the last Friday in September. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA is calculated; thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 10, all of South Dakota's 150 public school LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 150 LEAs, 15 met the minimum n-size requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated– one for each racial/ethnic group times the six primary disability categories). Please note that many LEAs in South Dakota have fewer than five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity; when this is disaggregated further by type of primary disability, the numbers get extremely small. Thus, very small numbers prevent SEP from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		99.86%	98.05%	99.57%	99.74%	99.88%	99.80%	99.70%	99.77%	99.86%	99.84%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
5,310	5,302	99.84%	100%	99.85%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	8

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Although South Dakota did not meet 100% compliance: the state showed substantial compliance with 99.85 of children who were evaluated within the state's established 25 school day timeline. Six incidents of non-compliance does not indicate a statewide systematic issue. Substantial training efforts have been made to inform LEAs of the policies and procedures necessary to meet the eligibility determination timeline. Five of the six LEAs were in compliance during the FFY 2014. Additional training and correction procedures have been put in place for the one LEA found non-compliant for a second year.

There are 6 out of 150 LEAs who did not meet the 100% target. All six LEAs did not meet the target for eight students due to staff calculation errors, evaluators unavailable, and failure to obtain permission to extend timeline.

Range of days beyond the timeline:

4 students over by 1 day

2 students over by 2 days

1 student over by 3 days

1 student over by 17 days

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

○   **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

◉   **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

○   **State monitoring**

◉   **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

SEP created an electronic system that all LEAs are required to utilize to track and annually report initial evaluations conducted in the LEA. LEAs may utilize a state developed spreadsheet located at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped-SPP.aspx to track students throughout the school year and upload into the secured electronic system or they may enter the students directly into the secured electronic system.

The data collection includes student ID, date permission received, date of last evaluation, the number of school days from permission received to evaluation completed, date eligibility is determined, and if needed the reason the timeline was exceed. The data is submitted and signed off by the LEA by August 1 of each fiscal year and it is reviewed by SEP for accuracy.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	5	null	1

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

South Dakota has verified that each child specific incidence of non-compliance was corrected (prong 1) and each of the late evaluations was completed properly. In addition to verifying the child specific non-compliance, SEP reviewed subsequent data and verified that five of the LEAs properly implemented the specific regulatory requirements (prong 2) as required in the OSEP 09-02 memo.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2014, six LEAs did not achieve 100% compliance for completing initial evaluations in the state designated 25 school day timeline. Each LEA had one or more students for which the timeline was not met which resulted in findings of non-compliance per LEA. SEP verified that each child specific incidence, of non-compliance, was corrected (prong 1) by verifying the completion of all evaluations. Additionally, the state reviewed the following year's initial evaluation data for each LEA held out of compliance. SEP verified that five of the LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2015 as required in the OSEP 09-02 memo.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA did not achieve 100% compliance on initial evaluation timelines in order to meet requirements in FFY 2015. The LEA was required to submit a 2015-16 report with 100% of initial evaluations completed within the 25 day timeline, however the LEA did not meet the requirement. The LEA has been placed on a new corrective action plan that includes training, quarterly data submission, desk audit for all student files not meeting compliance, and must achieve 100% compliance for 2016-17 to assure the LEA is in compliance with prong 2 for FFY 2016 as required by OSEP 09-02 memo.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.23%	99.76%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	692
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	196
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	435
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	4
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	55

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	435	437	99.76%	100%	99.54%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	2

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Although South Dakota did not meet the 100% compliance: the state showed substantial compliance with 99.54% of children referred to Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday. Two incidents of non-compliance does not indicate a statewide systematic issue. Substantial training efforts have been made to inform LEAs of the policies and procedures necessary to meet the eligibility determination timeline. Both LEAs were in 100% compliance during the FFY 2014.

There are 2 out of 150 LEAs who did not meet the 100% target. The 2 LEAs did not meet the target for three students due to staff scheduling errors and the LEA's failure to obtain permission to extend timeline.

Range of days beyond the timeline:

1 student over by 1 day

1 student over by 7 days

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
○ State monitoring
◉ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Part C Service Coordinators submit Part C exit data to the State Birth to 3 office. All exit code data are entered into the Part C data system by the Part C Data Manager. Then the Part B 619 Coordinator and Part C staff work collaboratively ensuring all students are accounted for in Indicator 12. After a complete analysis of the data, Part B 619 provides all LEAs with data verification through an electronic system which is due by September 1st of each year. LEAs that do not meet the required timeline are directly contacted and justification is required for students not having an IEP in place by their third birthday.

In addition, SEP verifies the data collected from Part C during onsite accountability monitoring visits. The team reviews early childhood files and monitors all students referred from Part C to Part B that were determined eligible and had an IEP in place by their 3rd birthday.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

South Dakota has verified that the child specific incidence of non-compliance was corrected (prong 1) and that the late evaluation was completed properly. In addition to verifying the child specific non-compliance, SEP reviewed subsequent data and verified that the LEA properly implemented the specific regulatory requirements (prong 2) as required in the OSEP 09-02 memo.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2014, one LEA did not achieve 100% compliance ensuring all students referred to Part B had an IEP developed and implemented by the student's 3rd birthday. The LEA had one student for which the requirement was not met, which resulted in findings of non-compliance for that LEA. SEP verified that the child specific incidence of non-compliance was corrected (prong 1) through the development and implementation of the current year's transition IEPs and that the late evaluation was completed properly. In addition to verifying the child specific non-compliance, SEP reviewed subsequent data and verified that the LEA properly implemented the specific regulatory requirements (prong 2) as required in the OSEP 09-02 memo.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						100%	92.43%	96.89%	78.40%	86.19%	85.28%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
146	178	85.28%	100%	82.02%

Explanation of Slippage

In 2015, SEP changed the data collection process. SEP implemented transition workshops and created a data collection process to help evaluate the process more thoroughly. The South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities made improving secondary transition a panel priority.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- ● State monitoring
- ○ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Indicator 13 is collected during on-site reviews utilizing the Indicator 13 checklist with the eight areas of review. LEAs must have all disability categories represented and two files per case manager available for the reviewers collecting Indicator 13 data.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
32	32	0	0

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2014, there were 32 specific individual cases of non-compliance in 11 LEAs. All 11 LEAs received a Corrective Action Plan. In the Corrective Action Plan, LEAs corrected the individual files of non-compliance (Prong 1). The LEAs were required to be trained and update policies and procedures around the area of non-compliance. Once individual files were corrected and policies and procedures were updated, the LEA submitted additional files to ensure verified correction and correct implementation of regulatory requirements (Prong 2) as indicated in OSEP Memo 09-02.

All 11 LEAs were verified to implement the regulatory requirements.

Indicator 13 is collected during on-site reviews. LEAs must have all disability categories represented and two files per case manager available for the reviewers collecting Indicator 13 data. When an issue of non-compliance is identified in a file, the LEA is required, through a Corrective Action Plan, to correct the individual file issue within one year of the date of the report. The correction is verified upon submission of the documentation either through transition report, consent to invite outside agency, updated transition IEP, meeting notice or student invite, or parental prior written notice.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2014, there were 32 specific individual cases of non-compliance in 11 LEAs. All 32 individual cases of non-compliance were verified corrected through process identified above.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

    A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
    B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
    C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							14.62%	15.00%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%
		Data						14.62%	8.69%	10.32%	13.30%	11.65%	20.18%
B	2009	Target ≥							66.08%	66.25%	66.50%	66.50%	67.00%
		Data						66.08%	57.45%	63.42%	67.10%	71.65%	74.22%
C	2009	Target ≥							80.41%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%
		Data						80.41%	72.98%	76.69%	77.80%	85.32%	82.29%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%
Target B ≥	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	68.50%
Target C ≥	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes to targets were made for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	418.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	66.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	254.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	7.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	16.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	66.00	418.00	20.18%	15.50%	15.79%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	320.00	418.00	74.22%	67.50%	76.56%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	343.00	418.00	82.29%	81.00%	82.06%

Was sampling used? No

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?   No

Plan submitted for approval: No Sampling Plan SubmittedNo Sampling Plan Submitted

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data				100%	100%		0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☐ Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

South Dakota remains under 10 resolution sessions in a year. No targets are required. Due Process resolution sessions were discussed at the January 2017 South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities meeting.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	n

Explanation of Alternate Data

Data was incorrectly reported in EMAPs and will be corrected during the resubmission period in May 2017. A resolution and agreement was signed through several resolution meetings between the parties, therefore 3.1 and 3.1.a on the survey should have been documented as 1.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	100%		

☑ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data was incorrectly reported in EMAPs and will be corrected during the resubmission period in May 2017. A resolution and agreement was signed through several resolution meetings between the parties, therefore 3.1 and 3.1.a on the survey should have been documented as 1.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data				60.00%	100%	100%	80.00%	75.00%	100%	100%	75.00%

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline   Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

South Dakota remains under 10 mediations in a year. No targets are required. Mediations were discussed at the January 2017 South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities meeting.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2	0	2	75.00%		100%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥		5.34%	9.84%
Data		4.84%	7.25%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	14.84%	22.84%	36.56%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The baseline data and the targets changed for two reasons. First, one of the six pilot districts dropped out of the project in 2016-17 due to leadership turnover and concerns with current capacity for implementation. Thus, baseline data was modified so it consisted of data for the five pilot districts. Second, the initial targets set for the SiMR were based on the statewide reading assessment that was given prior to 2013-14. In 2013-14, a new statewide reading assessment was administered and SD received a double testing waiver therefore there were no proficiency scores due to initial standard setting. In 2014-15 and 2015-16, South Dakota administered the Smarter Balanced assessment. Based on the data from the new assessment and using a similar target-setting process that was used previously (i.e., proficiency targets are based on reducing by half the percentage of students who are not proficient within six years), ambitious yet achievable targets were set for the SiMR considering stakeholder input.

Description of Measure

Included in South Dakota's Flexibility Waiver (**attached as flexibility waiver**) is an explanation of how targets are set for reducing the number of students who are not reaching proficiency according to the state assessment.

AMO goals and targets will be set as follows:

STEP 1: In the base year of each six-year cycle, calculate the percentage of students in the school who test at the Basic and Below Basic levels.

STEP 2: Divide this percentage in half. This is the school's goal for reducing, within six years, the percentage of students who are not proficient.

STEP 3: Subtract this amount from 100%. This is the inverse of the above and represents the school's goal for percentage of students testing at the Proficient and Advanced levels in six years.

STEP 4: Divide the amount in Step 2 by six. This is the school's annual target for increasing the percentage of students who are Proficient.

STEP 5: Calculate the percentage of students in the base year who test at the Proficient and Advanced levels.

STEP 6: To determine the AMO in Year 1, add the base year percentage of students testing at the Proficient and Advanced levels to the annual target for increasing the percentage of students who are proficient.

STEP 7: To determine the AMO in Years 2-6, add the annual target to the previous year's AMO

SD followed a similar process to set targets for the SSIP, but based on stakeholder feedback targets were not set at equal increments, rather they were set with smaller gains in the first two years to allow practices to be in place with larger gains in the proceeding years (attached as SIMR_Targets_2014).

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Programs office (SEP) set its targets after the selection of a Coherent Set of Improvement Strategies were identified, taking into consideration stakeholder input and the formula in the flexibility waiver to reduce achievement gaps. The targets are based on data from the six pilot LEAs that closely mirrors the state data. The improvement strategies identified proved to be key to the stakeholder recommendations as to the rate of change that will occur over the life of the SSIP.

Targets were set based on the master waiver gap reduction formula and stakeholder review of data, infrastructure, the SiMR and expected effectiveness of the selected improvement strategies. SEP obtained broad representation of stakeholders throughout the process of Phase I development. These discussions and analyses occurred with stakeholders at the state and local levels. SEP considered stakeholder input and obtained SEA Leadership approval at each point stakeholder recommendations were received. Stakeholders included:

- South Dakota State Board of Education;

- South Dakota SEA staff across departments (e.g., Special Education, Title I, Teaching and Learning, Assessment, and Data);

- South Dakota Special Education Advisory Council;

- Local Education Agency (LEA) Special Education Directors;

- Other LEA staff, as invited by the Special Education Director (e.g., Superintendent, Directors, and Title I Directors);

- South Dakota's Parent Connection;

- United States Department of Education (USDOE) Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP);

- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) state contact;

- Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs);

- Educators (general education and special education teachers);

- Parents.

These stakeholders were included as they either pay for, provide, receive, participate in or collaborate on Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) services and issues, and/or provide expertise. South Dakota's stakeholders are vital to the success of the SSIP and more specifically the outcomes as measured against the SiMR. Stakeholder efforts are valued and integral to the SSIP Phase I, as is their ongoing commitment to continue work towards improving outcomes for students with disabilities during subsequent phases.

Based on stakeholder input and feedback, South Dakota identified reading proficiency among students with learning disabilities entering grade four as the main focus for the SSIP and have set these Baseline and Target numbers for purpose of measuring the overall success of the SSIP.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Starting in April 2014, the Special Education Programs office (SEP) began conducting a broad data analysis review for purposes of Phase I of the SSIP. The SEP reviewed data in a variety of different ways and from various sources, including all 618 data submissions, the State Performance Plan Indicator data along with types of related services students received. The team narrowed the data points of interest to the area of reading proficiency of students with Specific Learning Disabilities.

In conjunction with a broad analysis of data, the team also began a broad review of the Department of Education (DOE) infrastructure, specifically looking at DOE's initiatives and goals aligning with contractor expertise; the consensus of this statewide review was that the focus would be on reading. Because the key considerations of the infrastructure analysis were the years of Reading in Response to Intervention work, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support including Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, the South Dakota DOE's overall goal of "all students entering 4th grade will be proficient or advance in reading", along with several other initiatives focused on reading, the stakeholder groups and SEP planning team determined that the data point identified (reading proficiency of students with Specific Learning Disabilities) would fit within these existing initiatives and would align with existing infrastructure efforts.

On June 23, 2014, a large stakeholder group was brought together to conduct a more in-depth data analysis. The group conducted data analysis around students with disabilities reading proficiency scores. The group reviewed data disaggregated by:

- Ethnicity/Disability/Educational Service Agency (ESA)

- Female/Male

- Demographics/Native American/Disability Category

- Middle School and High School dropout?

- Why Resource Room and Separate class not doing as well?

- Performance related to Professional Attendance? Highly Qualified Staff?

- Why numbers of students dropping out as get older (exit)? Disability Category / Grade

- Placement agency/General Education Setting/Proficiency

- ESA/Male verse Female

- Female Native American/Male Native American proficiency

- Other Health Impaired/Emotional Disturbance/Specific Learning Disability

Data questions which were noted/identified as possible needs:

- Is there information on reading instruction, teacher effectiveness and summer slide?

- Possible New Data collection?

- Collecting Child Count Data on which area of Specific Learning Disabilities does a student qualify.

- How to measure reading proficiency and benchmark/progress in Preschool to grade 3

- Other data points that could be used and limitation of access (Dibbles/AIMS/etc…)

- Strategies used in Early Intervention

- Prior Response To Intervention pilot LEAs doing better? They are closing the Native American Gap.

- Native American and other ethnicities

- Instruction: general education and resource room – Is there a difference?

After the data analysis by the stakeholder group, the group decided to support one of the Office of Special Education Program recommendations to focus on improving the reading proficiency for students with specific learning disabilities by the 3rd grade statewide assessment.

The following graph was an example of the different data breakdowns reviewed (see file: summaryproficiencyjune6.pdf).

Note: Special Education is demonstrating Specific Learning Disability Category but same breakdown occurred for a variety of other data.

Data analyzed in October 2nd Stakeholder Meeting and internally in Department of Education:

Special Education Programs provided stakeholders information on proficiency levels of students with IEPs on each reading standard according to the Statewide Assessment. There were no patterns on proficiency levels related to different grade levels or cohort groups. Information also included data on statewide accommodations related to reading; for example, almost 60% of our students with disabilities receive "read aloud" as an accommodation on the statewide assessment.

The Response to Intervention Coordinator provided the group with information on reading issues identified in the pilot LEAs. LEAs had to work through conducting, understanding, and utilizing data to determine appropriate targeted interventions. Once teachers received instruction to analyze data, they learned to group students according skills they needed to develop. Teachers then received professional development in instruction of reading through CORE Foundational Reading. Once they understood the strengths and weakness in their instruction, teachers could better intervene with the students in their classroom. RTI data showed that students then made growth whether a general education student or student with a disability.

Description of Concerns:

Since the assessment data file only includes whether a student is on an IEP and does not include a student's demographic information such as disability category, the child count and assessment file were merged. Due to the assessment file including more students than child count, some of the student's disability categories could not be matched.

A question also came up about how to measure growth prior to the statewide assessment at end of 3rd grade.

South Dakota is developing assessment reports in the longitudinal data system (SD-STARS), which will allow LEAs to disaggregate the all-assessed report by disability category, setting category, and grade. A DIBELS and AIMSweb report is being developed for the 44 LEAs who signed an agreement to upload the data. Both reporting features should be in place by summer of 2015. LEAs implementing state specific interventions will send progress data to the state yearly for reporting purposes.

Compliance Data:

South Dakota's compliance indicators reflect a high level of compliance. The Corrective Action Plans (CAP) from the reviews indicated skill-based assessment is an area several LEAs are not understanding. Unfortunately, data has not been collected specifically in areas where reading was the issue. South Dakota is currently in the process of developing and moving toward a results-driven accountability monitoring system.

Description of Stakeholder Involvement:

The main stakeholder group for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) was selected based on several factors. The state Special Education Program office (SEP) ensures that the entire state geographic area is covered along with different LEA sizes in order to adequately represent the diversity in South

Dakota. Personnel were selected which represented special education administrators, superintendents, current special education professors from IHEs, parents, educational agencies, educational cooperative staff, reading interventionists, special education teachers, behavior specialists, Birth to Three (Part C) representative, Title office, Division of Learning and Instruction, the State Library, Division of Education Services and Supports director, State Performance Plan coordinators, Parent Connections (PTI Center), contractors specializing in behavior and instruction and Special Education Program staff.

January 2015-Special Education Advisory Panel reviewed the State Systemic Improvement Plan and was given the opportunity to share their ideas.

Based on preliminary feedback from OSEP the baseline and targets have been changed to reflect the six pilot districts information verses the whole state.

Each pilot LEA has been given the opportunity to apply for a grant provided by the Office of Special Education Programs to support their work on the SSIP. The grant application entails how the LEA will support the theory of action and what supports are needed to improve results for the target population.

On March 23 and 24th, 2015, SD Special Education programs staff shared with the Special Education Advisory Panel how the coherent improvement plan was developed with the six pilot LEAs. At this time the advisory panel did not recommend any changes to the plan.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

South Dakota began planning for the development of the SSIP once the changes to the SPP/APR package were finalized and published by OSEP. The South Dakota Special Education Programs office (SEP) held initial planning meetings with key department leadership and staff to ensure understanding of what was meant by Infrastructure Analysis as part of the Phase I activities under Indicator 17. OSEP TA centers were consulted as well as OSEP state contacts. Early in 2014 a team of SEA staff attended a regional SSIP planning event that included state level data analysis and infrastructure analysis strategies and reviews of planning and analysis tools and processes. From that "kick-off" meeting, SEP began contacting key stakeholders to schedule work groups and planning meetings. SD SEP staff held meetings with the leadership team at DOE to explain the SSIP effort under the revised SPP/APR package and to brainstorm ideas. The resulting ideas were then discussed by staff for relevance to this effort.

Using the SSIP Phase I development framework created by the RRCP (see attached slide: PhaseIVisualFramework), the SEP began with a broad look at the state's current infrastructure, considering the various nuances, dynamics, and context specific to our state. Several broad guiding questions were developed to help paint the infrastructure picture. SEP understood the need to identify and consider existing efforts, including state and local initiatives and to identify the priorities within the state from a broad perspective.

Initial Guiding Questions and discussion needs for Broad Analysis:

- Define current conditions for each area of the state systems: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring.
- What are the current SEA level initiatives?
- What do we know about what the locals are doing? What are their priorities?
- Where is the money going? Current focus and uses of discretionary grant money.
- Professional Development and Technical Assistance efforts to-date; what impact, if any has it had on student outcome improvement?
- Beginning to consider data as part of infrastructure analysis, what data sources does the state have and how is it being used to assess infrastructure? What data is needed?
- Recognizing the value and need for stakeholder input: Who are our stakeholders? What do stakeholders need to know to be able to help in the analysis and development of a plan? How can stakeholders be meaningfully involved in the Phase I activities and beyond?

These questions were used to further provide the basis for additional planning ahead of the first stakeholder planning meeting related specifically to conducting a more in-depth state-wide analysis of infrastructure.

An in-depth Infrastructure Analysis meeting was conducted with a broad stakeholder group in June 2014. Participants included the SD parent center, representatives from LEAs, IHE's and the SEA. The goal of this meeting was to conduct a thorough review of existing initiatives across the state and determine how these existing initiatives may impact the emerging SiMR statement, as well as to determine alignment with any emerging Improvement Strategies that are currently being implemented by LEAs or that need to be developed and implemented as part of Phase 2 and 3 of the SSIP process.
In preparation for this meeting, SEP developed a comprehensive list of SEA level initiatives, activities, events, resources and processes that might be used in consideration of SSIP Phase I activities and RDA work (see attachment: reading work in doe.docx). Additionally, a SWOT Analysis framework was developed by the planning team for use in the in-depth analysis process (see attachment: swot notes june 23, 2014 meeting.docx).

Based on input from stakeholders, themes were developed within each of the four SWOT quadrants (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). Key themes were identified as follows:

- Strengths: SEA level collaboration (de-siloing of education department); Early Intervention (RTI, MTSS, EIS coaching and staff development); Literacy Initiatives (statewide emphasis on reading proficiency and use of evidence-based practices).
- Weaknesses: Teacher Qualifications and Availability (preservice and turnover issues); Time (full plates); Funding; Ruralness of state.
- Opportunities: Collaboration between state agencies, partners, and LEAs; Increased reading proficiency leading to lower dropout rates and increased school completion; incorporate reading skills into all subjects; increase parental involvement.
- Threats: Teacher workload issues; lack of buy-in; perceived lack of time; silos not fully deconstructed.

Of particular concern and focus for the SSIP planning team based on the stakeholder input and analysis work were the issues around teacher qualifications, use of evidence-based practices, improved collaboration across state agencies, and increased parental involvement. Further discussions of infrastructure and capacity included the state and local capacity related to data analysis processes, including knowledge and use of data for improvement planning.

Results from the SWOT Analysis (see SDSWOTforStakeholders_collated) were taken and used in subsequent smaller group, focused infrastructure analysis activities.

In final preparation to fulfill Phase I activities of the SSIP and begin work on Phase II, SEP planned and conducted a "pilot district" improvement strategy work group meeting with key LEAs involved in beginning the implementation of the SSIP. During this meeting participants were provided with a review of the SSIP work completed to-date, including the data analysis process that led to the SiMR, results from the infrastructure analysis activities completed so far, and a review of existing statewide initiatives that have bearing on the SiMR. The goals of this meeting were to finalize a set of Coherent Improvement Strategies and a Theory of Action based on the data and infrastructure analysis work completed so far. Please see the following attachments to review outcomes of this meeting: pilot_district_survey.pdf; pilot_district_initiatives_in_place.docx; coherentimprovementstrategies.docx.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Students with Specific Learning Disabilities will increase reading proficiency prior to fourth grade from 33.16% to 41.83% by 2018 as measured by the statewide assessment.

Description

South Dakota's SIMR aligns with Indicator 3 (attached as Indicator3a, Indicator3b, Indicator3c) . This Indicator measures the participation and performance rate on the state assessment.

During our data analysis the SLD category students in resource room were the 3rd lowest achieving subgroup. Only cognitive disabilities and multiple disabilities scored lower. After reviewing the data in a variety of ways, including; 618 data submissions, State Performance Plan data along with additional child count information, the team returned to SLD category reading proficiency deficits.

The SSIP Stakeholder Group consisted of the following: special education administrators, superintendent, current special education professor, parents, educational agency, educational cooperative staff, reading interventionist, special education teachers, behavior specialist, Birth to Three representative, Title office, Division of Learning and Instruction, State Library, Division of Education Services and Supports director, State Performance Plan coordinators, Parent Connections (PTI Center), contractors specializing in behavior and instruction and Special Education Program staff.

The special education advisory panel has also contributed as stakeholders. This panel includes: parents, higher education personal, vocational school personal, administrator, state juvenile/adult corrections, welfare/foster care, McKinney-Vento, private school, teacher, SEP staff.

Current initiatives in South Dakota Department of Education were compiled to initiate support for the SIMR. All departments at SD-DOE were included in the compilation (attached as Reading Work in DOE).

Addressing this SIMR will impact SLD student achievement in reading. The gap between students with disabilities and specific learning disability students will be reduced by 50% by 2018. The state will begin with six pilot LEAs in the first year of the SSIP. The six LEAs and their student level data are attached (pilot district data2). This LEAs were chosen for LEA size, location in the state, student population, SLD population in K-3rd grade, and other profile information. Based on the first year with these pilot LEAs, improvements will be calculated and strategies adjusted for a state-wide model.

June 23rd, 2014-SSIP Stakeholder meeting-

The SSIP Stakeholder Group consisted of the following: special education administrators, superintendent, current special education professor, parents, educational agency, educational cooperative staff, reading interventionist, special education teachers, behavior specialist, Birth to Three representative, Title office, Division of Learning and Instruction, State Library, Division of Education Services and Supports director, State Performance Plan coordinators, Parent Connections (PTI Center), contractors specializing in behavior and instruction and Special Education Program staff.

Outcomes:

- Gain an understanding of recent hot topics in special education and discuss strategies to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Gain a better understanding of state-wide data to help guide the SSIP and provide input into the development of the SSIP.
- Gain a better understanding of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and receive stakeholder advice on the issue of improving reading proficiency of students with learning disabilities regarding Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (attached as SWOT notes June 23, 2014).

September 30th, 2014-Special Education Advisory Panel Meeting-

This panel includes: parents, higher education personal, vocational school personal, administrator, state juvenile/adult corrections, welfare/foster care, McKinney-Vento, private school, teacher, SEP staff.

Agenda:

- Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities.
- Advise the SEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under Section 618 of the Act-State Performance Plan Coordinators, State Systemic Improvement Plan
- Advise the SEA of unmet needs within the state in the education of students with disabilities

October 2nd, 2014-SSIP Stakeholder meeting-

The SSIP Stakeholder Group consisted of the following: special education administrators, superintendent, current special education professor, parents, educational agency, educational cooperative staff, reading interventionist, special education teachers, behavior specialist, Birth to Three representative, Title office, Division of Learning and Instruction, State Library, Division of Education Services and Supports director, State Performance Plan coordinators, Parent Connections (PTI Center), contractors specializing in behavior and instruction and Special Education Program staff.

Outcomes:

- Gain an understanding of requirements from OSEP related to the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP, Indicator 17).
- Gain a better understanding of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) information from the previous Stakeholder input meeting, as well as a review of data related to reading proficiency of students with learning disabilities.
- Provide input into the development of the SSIP, specifically related to helping identify root causes, setting a baseline and target for the SSIP, and identifying improvement strategies.

January 14th, 2014-Pilot District Strategy Planning Meeting

The stakeholders at this meeting were the proposed pilot LEAs for the 2015-16 school year. Prior to this meeting there was a survey sent to all staff in the LEAs who worked with K-3rd grade reading (results attached as pilot district survey). The LEAs compiled a list of the initiatives in their LEAs currently (attached as pilot district initiatives in place). After looking at the state and LEA initiatives there was discussion on the strategies needed to make improvements in SLD students. The list of coherent improvement strategies was compiled.(coherent improvement strategies attached)

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

South Dakota's Set of Coherent Improvement Strategies was determined through a systematic process of data analysis and infrastructure analysis conducted by a series of SEP internal and external stakeholder group meetings. Based on stakeholder input, the specific improvement strategies are framed within four broader areas of improvement that align with state and local initiatives as well as federal guidance related to the focus for results-driven accountability:

Data Analysis
Districts can provide:

- Monthly meetings on progress (data analysis) to monitor and guide instruction.

State support:

- Understanding and applying special education evaluation data to plan instruction (PD).
- Train districts on data workbook use (PD).

Instructional Practices and Strategies
Districts can provide:

- Review schedules at the building level to improve efficiency.
- Review evaluation components and the impact on instructional practices.

State support:

- Foundational reading professional development.
- Design matrix of intervention strategies tied to reading components (research-based strategies and programs).

Collaboration
Districts can provide:

- "De-silo" departments and staff within a district (all students are all teachers' students).
- Train general education staff about students with specific learning disabilities.
- Model how to instruct or support students in the general education classroom.

State support:

- Guidance on how to de-silo staff within a district (all students are all teacher's students).
- General education and special education collaboration and communication PD (common language, curriculum knowledge).

Family and Community Engagement
Districts can provide:

- Student-led portfolios at conferences.
- Improve parent involvement in Reading as needed (specific to district).
- Create positive experiences for parents (emotionally safe environment).

State support:

- Professional Development or materials for district staff in engaging parents.

Throughout the SSIP process we have gathered information from stakeholders and had DOE internal conversations concerning improvement strategies to decrease the gap between specific learning disability (SLD) students and all students with disabilities (SWD). SEP conducted a survey of what was currently being done in the pilot districts (attached as Pilot District Survey) and what initiatives are in place at the SD-DOE (attached as reading work at DOE). This inquiry created a list of hypothesis which included:

- There is a shift in education that has impacted student outcomes. This shift has required teachers to acquire new skills they may not currently have due to a variety of factors (school climate/culture, lagging teacher prep programs, data drill-down understanding, evidence based practices, alignment of student need and instruction, teacher impact on achievement).

- South Dakota is currently supporting Multi-Systems of Support (MTSS) which includes Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (RTI). RTI is an effective program because it is a systems approach, an Every-Ed initiative (It's not a general education initiative and it's not a special education initiative, it's an 'every education' initiative), about prevention, collaborative-team oriented process, and is a process that relies on strong core instruction. RTI coordinators who support schools with trainings and guidance have been an active part in K-3 reading improvement. We have used their knowledge to create a plan to close the reading gap in K-3 students. The coherent improvement strategies were based on pilot district needs.

The RTI model in South Dakota is designed to help teachers select and design student learning targets, increase teacher knowledge and skills, select and/or develop tightly aligned materials, monitor implementation with fidelity. These strategies have been proven in South Dakota(attached 2007-2012 RTI Data). When looking at the data from the schools involved in RTI during the years 2007-2012, each benchmark period showed improved achievement. Slide one combines all grade levels in which proficiency increased each benchmark period. Slides 3-6 separate the scores by grade level proficiency. Each benchmark period by grade level also showed increased proficiency.

During the October 2nd, 2014 Stakeholder meeting the root cause for reading deficits in SLD students was determined to be:

- Shifts in education, which impact all students, are requiring teachers to have skills that they don't have due to a variety of factors.
- Culture/climate of the school.
- Progression of education.
- Maintaining teacher mentor programs - the effectiveness of the teacher has the greatest impact on students.
- Teacher prep programs.
- Data drill down understanding by teachers.

The coherent improvement strategies will target the root causes and build capacity for South Dakota and support systemic change. A logical team approach will begin the process of collaboration at each district level. Districts will be provided the training they need to support the shift to data driven instruction. That support will include instructional coaches and trainings designed for needs specific to reading.
South Dakota Department of Education Special Education Program has also purchased DirectSTEP reading related courses/modules for paraprofessionals. The courses are:

- Roles and Responsibilities of the Paraeducator
- Assessment, Diagnosis and Evaluation
- Improving Behavior
- Paraeducator Support: Instructional Content and Practice

All of the coherent improvement strategies will encompass general education teachers, special education teachers, and para-professionals. The strategies will also be specific to those employed at a district as instructional coaches and RTI Interventionists. This will ensure an implementation framework which will support systemic change.
Through the State infrastructure analyses, it has been determined that LEAs are in need of support that will create a shift in the educational structure to data driven instruction. The strategies are determined to improve results when used with fidelity.

The above strategies will target all district staff who work with K-3rd grade students. The SIMR is specific to K-3rd grade SLD students but the stakeholders feel it is vital to strengthen all CORE teachers to create a preventative model for South Dakota.
During stakeholder meetings and internal conversations, high staff turnover across the state was discussed. This training could target district staff with job assignments of curriculum specialists, reading coaches, RTI coaches, and reading interventionists. They will not only participate in the coherent improvement strategies provided above, but will have additional trainings as needed to continue to support new staff. This will assure continuity and sustainability of the increased reading outcomes for all students and specifically SLD students.

To scale up support to school districts and strengthen the reading structure a team approach will be built with school districts. The first year of the SIMR will include pilot districts and then support will be expanded state-wide. The pilot districts encompass 1/3 of the SLD population. This will offer a good indicator of the adjustments needed as the project continues. Also, during the pilot year, the state will build trainer capacity and support.

- Input from stakeholders included the following evidence – based strategies based on http://www.readingrockets.org/ and
- National Reading Panel report http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/documents/report.pdf

Oct. 2, 2014 SSIP Stakeholder meeting hypothesis

- Increase foundational reading skills thru professional development would improve reading skills.
- SLO (Student Learning Objectives) to support progress monitoring.
- Formative assessment strategies (on-going and not one end of year assessment).
- Data driven instructional strategies.
- Train the trainer models.
- Research based instruction (direct and explicit instruction).
- Teacher training and support for higher education and practicing teachers.

January 14th, 2015 SSIP Pilot District meeting

Districts were surveyed prior to the meeting to determine what they had in place to improve reading instruction. All staff who worked on K-3rd grade reading in the pilot districts was included. <mark>(Pilot district survey results attached)</mark>.

Current district initiatives discussed <mark>(attached as pilot district initiatives in place)</mark>.

Coherent improvement strategies where suggested by pilot districts. <mark>(attached as coherent improvement strategies)</mark>.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☐ **Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

The South Dakota Special Education Programs office (SEP) continued its collaborative approach to improving the state infrastructure by engaging the broad stakeholder groups that were involved in Phase I of the SSIP (State Systemic Improvement Plan). While SEP engaged stakeholders at various levels throughout the year, the department intentionally brought stakeholder workgroups together on two centralized occasions to conduct Phase II planning meetings and gather stakeholder input. As described below, the stakeholders represented both special and general education perspectives in order to help provide a complete understanding of state infrastructure across all systems.

The first meeting was held in July 2015 and focused on the development of the evaluation component of the SSIP Phase II (see ssippilotmtgagenda20150715.pdf). Participants included parents, the local education agency (LEA) leadership from the "Pilot LEAs" (a subset of LEAs currently participating in the SSIP), IHE representatives, representatives from other state and federal programs at the South Dakota State Department of Education (SEA) level, representatives from Early Childhood Section 619 as well as Part C, and teacher leader representatives. Generally, stakeholders received an update and overview of the Phase II components, including the need to ensure the SEA continues to improve its infrastructure in order to support LEAs and their implementation of the SSIP. The pilot LEAs came to this meeting with data regarding current initiatives in place at the LEA level—an exhaustive list of student level and systems level efforts being implemented (see DistrictInitiativesInventory.doc). The SEP developed a District Initiatives Inventory tool for LEAs to use to help districts further identify the relationship between existing efforts and the potential impact on the SiMR. Based on three of the four broad "standards of action" contained in the "Theory of Action," guiding questions were developed to provide direction for identifying existing initiatives:

1. Data Analysis: What data analysis processes surrounding students with specific learning disabilities do you use/will you use among staff members at the K-3 level?
2. Instructional Practices and Strategies: What instructional practices and strategies targeted toward students with specific learning disabilities do you currently use/will you use with K-3 staff?
3. Collaboration: What type of collaborative processes do you have/will you have between general education and special education teachers at the K-3 level that relate to students with specific learning disabilities?

Using this tool, LEAs further rated their current success at implementing each initiative and identified the expected outcome of the initiative, what evidence exists to support the outcome, and any evidence that the initiative was implemented with fidelity.

Data from this tool was summarized and put into a template that could be used by the state SSIP core team for further analysis and planning (<mark>see activitylistbygroup.pdf</mark>). Data from this meeting was used to continue developing the Evaluation Plan under Phase II. For example, specific initiatives identified by the pilot LEAs and discussed as a group through this process were chosen to further develop and implement Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs), against which data would be gathered, measured, and reported on for purposes of the Evaluation Plan. An example of an LEA-specific initiative being implemented, which became a broad category of an EBP, is the Data Workbook developed by the state to help LEAs understand data and use it to inform instructional practices.

Another stakeholder meeting was held in December 2015 with a broader scope of work, including a review of recent information obtained from the South Dakota team participating in the NCSI Cross-State Collaborative focusing on language and literacy technical assistance meetings. The workgroup continued to develop the evaluation plan but also engaged in activities that helped participants understand the SSIP implementation factors related to infrastructure. For example, the group engaged in pre-work at the LEA level, identifying existing structures that support improving outcomes for students. They were then able to come to this meeting prepared to review individual LEA data with the larger SEA group, and they held focused conversations to identify additional supports that may be needed, including what the SEA should consider changing or improving with regard to the infrastructure components of professional development, fiscal resources, and technical assistance.

Through this process of stakeholder engagement, the state was able to identify the current initiatives—including general and special education—that potentially impact the SIMR (<mark>see activitylistbygroup.pdf</mark>). Input from stakeholders and the state SSIP core team suggests that efforts need to be considered to further align pilot LEA utilization of fiscal support and SEA-provided professional development related to focusing efforts on the implementation of EBPs in order to impact the SIMR. Due to the local control climate in the state of South Dakota, LEAs have flexibility in their use of resources and must implement

EBPs within the context of existing local curricula and instructional priorities. There has been excellent participation and cooperation on behalf of the pilot LEA leadership. The expectation is that stakeholder groups, the state SSIP core team, and pilot LEAs will continue to develop and implement SSIP activities, efforts, and initiatives—including EBPs. By completing these activities, efforts, and initiative a positive impact should be shown through the SIMR As South Dakota moves into Phase III of the SSIP, the state will take steps to ensure pilot LEAs and additional LEAs beginning to implement identified EBPs will have the data, research, and professional development necessary to build capacity in order to facilitate removal of potential barriers and help align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives.

The state SSIP core team has been extremely focused on developing and implementing the SSIP. The state SSIP core team includes the SEP director, a state SSIP core team lead designated by the SEP director, and other SEP staff as assigned. The SEP has also accessed the support of consultants in order to facilitate stakeholder engagement, develop tools for data analysis and stakeholder input, and design and implement the SSIP evaluation plan. This state SSIP core team is cognizant of and uses the federal SSIP phased timeframes as a guide for planning and scheduling SSIP activities.

See the following timeline for key activities:

Internal Timeline for Phase II

Activity	Deadline	Persons Responsible	Comments
Stakeholder Meeting (Pilot LEA Directors)	July 15, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Completed
Stakeholder Meeting (Larger Group)	Dec 3, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Completed
Stakeholder Meeting (Pilot LEA Directors)	Jan 21, 2016	State SSIP Core Team	Address questions and strategize challenges; work on alignment
SEP Advisory Panel SSIP Review	March 21, 2016	SEP Advisory Panel Members and SEP Team	Conduct a detailed review of the SSIP Phase II draft
Stakeholder Conference Call Meeting (Pilot LEA Directors)	March 29, 2016	State SSIP Core Team Lead	Discuss progress of activities and provide TA for the evaluation plan tracking system
Stakeholder Meeting (Larger group)	TBD May/June 2016	State SSIP Core Team	Discuss current data and consider benchmark and SIMR data points

Tools Development

Activity	Deadline	Persons Responsible	Comments
District Initiative Inventory	June 1, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Ready for July stakeholder meeting
Logic Model Questions	June 1, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Ready for July stakeholder meeting
Other Data Collection Tools	July 1, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Discuss and list draft data collection tools; have ready for July stakeholder meeting for finalization
Tools Finalization	Dec 3, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Ready for December stakeholder meeting
Evaluation Plan Draft	Dec 3, 2015	State SSIP Core Team	Ready for December stakeholder meeting
Logic Model	Dec 1, 2015	Evaluator Consult	
Data Collection tools	Dec 1, 2015	State SSIP Core Team Lead and Consult	

South Dakota has historically valued its relationship with, and the involvement of, various stakeholders at all levels of the educational system surrounding students with disabilities. The state SSIP core team built upon this value in its strategic approach to developing the SSIP, starting with Phase I. As demonstrated in the "Theory of Action," two of the four broad standards of action include **"Parent Involvement"** and **"Collaboration."** From a broad perspective, these two standards guide the larger work of ensuring stakeholders charged with supporting students with disabilities understand the emphasis on Results-Driven Accountability (RDA), the SSIP, and, more specifically, the SiMR.

One of the leverage points in the South Dakota SSIP is the intersection between Part C and Part B SSIP efforts; both programs have aligned efforts in support of literacy outcomes. The state is integrating Part C data with the Part B data system in order to develop a longitudinal data system that will help paint a picture of a student with a disability from Birth to age 21. Part C and B SSIP teams have collaborated and shared information as part of the SSIP

development process.

As described earlier, the state SSIP core planning team continued to ensure stakeholder involvement during the early development of Phase II of the SSIP early on. There was no disruption or "break" as the state transitioned into the second phase of development; the conversation continued early in Phase II with regular conference calls and onsite stakeholder workgroup planning meetings with pilot LEAs, parent representatives, other state and federal project representatives, and local school implementers. The SEP director worked closely with the Division Director for Educational Services and Supports in order to ensure awareness across state offices. The SEP invited the state Division Director of Learning and Instruction to the NCSI Cross-State Collaborative, focusing on language and literacy, to participate as a member of the state SSIP core team. This allowed for rich and productive discussion between multiple state offices, which are helping to identify areas of infrastructure that need strengthening and leveraging. As a result, the conversations on how the SEA can collaborate to better support literacy efforts have been expanded; efforts do not have as much of a "parallel" structure to them as in the past. Subsequent SEA planning meetings have been held across state offices, which have resulted in more efficient application of the initiatives and resources that will ultimately have bearing on the SIMR.

The SEP will ensure that the Division Director for Educational Services and Supports, the Division Director of Learning and Instruction, and other SEA leadership continue to be involved and informed of SSIP efforts. One way the SEP will continue to involve SEA staff is by presenting and seeking input at bi-weekly Statewide System of Recognition, Accountability, and Support (SSRAS) meetings. Equal efforts will be made to ensure the participation of LEA leadership across general and special education programs.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

The state of South Dakota will support LEAs in implementing the EBPs that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices in order to achieve the SiMR for children with disabilities through grant funding and professional development. In Phase II, six pilot districts received training through a research-based reading program recognized by the National Reading Panel that included coaching and data analysis training. This program was selected based on statewide use of the program as well as the effective results the state has seen using this program.

The SEP has held several meetings during the Phase I and Phase II development with the six pilot LEAs, allowing the pilot LEAs to share their concerns and needs moving into Phase II. On July 15, 2015, the six pilot LEAs met to share activities and initiatives each pilot LEA had in place for the four standards of action (Data Analysis, Instructional Practices & Strategies, Collaboration, and Family & Community Involvement) outlined in South Dakota's "Theory of Action." The SEP found commonalities among all six pilot LEAs and shared ideas for planning the implementation of activities in Phase II next steps.

The state SSIP core team focused on the infrastructure needs of each of the six pilot LEAs. Working across departments, the SEP arranged to have professional development trainings in order to improve the literacy structure. Together, the SEP and the Division of Learning and Instruction held four separate trainings for district representatives. Trainings included a research-based reading program training recognized by the National Reading Panel, a coaching training, a data analysis training, and two school-based assessment trainings. Both offices focusing on improving literacy structures allowed for readiness and built capacity for implementation within LEAs, schools, and personnel/provider practices. The six pilot LEAs submitted beginning achievement data on students with specific learning disabilities in the fall, reported their progress on activities in the winter and spring, and will submit ending achievement data on students with specific learning disabilities—along with progress on activities—at the beginning of the summer to the state SSIP core team.

Each pilot LEA sent a staff member representing the district to attend a coaching training and a train-the-trainer training. Data Workbook and benchmark assessment tool trainings were also optional trainings offered to each of the six pilot LEAs. Trained LEA representatives have begun implementing the trainings in each district to elementary general education teachers, special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and support staff. For the 2015-2016 school year, trainings will include data analysis and instructional practices and strategies. Special education directors in each pilot LEA will communicate with building principals to implement the trainings in their district. General and special education teachers will implement the practices in their classrooms.

The SEP communicates with the six pilot LEAs through small and large stakeholder meetings, emails, and conference calls. The smaller stakeholder meetings include the six pilot LEAs. The larger stakeholder meetings include a wide range of participants.

Stakeholder involvement includes:

- South Dakota State Board of Education
- South Dakota SEA staff across departments (e.g., Special Education, Title 1, Teaching, and Learning, Assessment, and Data)
- South Dakota Special Education Advisory Council
- LEA Special Education Directors
- Other LEA staff as invited by the Special Education Director (e.g., superintendent, directors, and Title 1 directors)
- South Dakota's Parent Connections
- United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) state contact
- Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Educators (general and special education teachers)
- Parents

The smaller stakeholder group held a meeting on July 15, 2015, to find common activities and initiatives among the six pilot LEAs.

On December 3, 2015, a larger stakeholder group meeting was held to share next steps and receive stakeholder input on the activities the pilot LEAs would be implementing in the future.

January 21, 2016: The smaller stakeholder group consisting of the six pilot LEAs held a meeting to finalize the evaluation plan. The six LEAs were given the opportunity to share ideas on tools for measuring fidelity of implementation for EBPs. Based on the shared ideas, the state SSIP core team presented short- and long-term activities on a matrix. The matrix also outlined the timeline for completion. The smaller stakeholder group was given time to review and share ideas for each activity. The smaller stakeholder group also shared ideas for the timeline for completion on each activity. A final decision for activities and a

timeline was agreed upon among the smaller stakeholder group. The state SSIP core team will administer, collect, and analyze evaluation tools from each of the six pilot LEAs.

When looking at the infrastructure of the six pilot LEAs, there are many barriers in Phase I. These barriers include: local control, different professional development needs, individual district priorities, and remote and limited resources (e.g., travel, districts are spread among the state, etc.). The SEP has worked with the six pilot LEAs to differentiate professional development and allow for flexibility in order to impact South Dakota's SiMR for the SSIP.

Based on infrastructure barriers, in the 2015-2016 school year not all pilot LEAs were able to implement all four of the standards of action (Data Analysis, Instructional Practices &Strategies, Collaboration, Family & Community Involvement) as laid out in the "Theory of Action." Five of the six pilot LEAs were able to implement the "instructional practices & strategies"; the sixth district will implement it in the summer of 2016. Through their grant activities, all six pilot LEAs were able to begin implementation of "data analysis" in the 2015-2016 school year.

Moving forward into Phase III of the SSIP, the six pilot LEAs will begin implementation of common EBPs in the areas of "collaboration" and "family & community involvement" in the 2016-2017 school year. The SEP will be measuring implementation of the activities and initiatives with fidelity. Each of the six pilot LEAs have submitted data showing activities and student growth.

(see SDSSIPEvaluationPlan 2015-16.docx showing the expected timeline for the 2015-2016 school year)

(see SDSSIPLogicModel.pdf exhibiting the short- and long-term goals for the SEP's SSIP)

(see sdtheoryofactiongraphic2.docx for the SEP's SSIP)

The SEP has been speaking statewide on South Dakota's SSIP. The SEP holds monthly special education director calls, updating districts statewide on the SSIP progress. A representative from the SEP—the state SSIP core team lead—has made appearances at regional conferences, updating districts on the progress and future goal for South Dakota's SSIP. The state SSIP core team lead has presented South Dakota SSIP documents to the South Dakota Special Education Advisory Council. The SEP Advisory Panel was able to provide input concerning the implementation of activities of the six LEA pilot districts and the impact the activities will have on the state's SIMR.

The state SSIP core team has worked across departments to support the LEAs in scaling up the implementation of EBPs. The SEP has worked alongside the Division of Learning and Instruction, Title I, and Birth to 3 offices to improve literacy structures. The state SSIP core team has worked to build a cohesive team across departments. The SEP Part B and Part C have data systems that are aligned with each other. This allows for work to be completed in a joint effort.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

The state SSIP core team will oversee the evaluation. The state SSIP core team consists of internal SEP staff members and an external evaluator.

The state SSIP core team created a logic model that specifies the inputs, outputs, and outcomes (see SDSSIPLogicModel.pdf). The logic model provides details on how each of the four coherent improvement strategies will lead to various short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes.

The logic model specifies the global relationship with the "Theory of Action" and the evaluation questions. In addition, the state SSIP core team created a "Detailed Evaluation Plan" that shows each of the evaluation questions that will be measured for each coherent improvement strategy (see SD SSIP Detailed Evaluation Questions 2015-16.docx), as well as an "Evaluation Plan Overview" for the state SSIP core team and the pilot LEAs to use as a reference for when, where, and how evaluations are to be completed (see SD SSIP Evaluation Plan 2015-16.docx).

For each coherent improvement strategy, a standard set of evaluation questions will be answered. These questions are grouped into "Input," "Output," and "Outcomes" questions, as follows:

Input Questions

1. Were the inputs used sufficiently?
2. What amount of resources were used?

Output Questions

1. Did each of the specified activities occur?
2. Who participated in the specified activities?
3. Did the targeted people participate in the activities?
4. Were the activities delivered with fidelity?
5. Were participants satisfied with the activities?

Outcome Questions

Short-Term

1. Did the participants acquire new knowledge, skills, and attitudes?

Medium-Term

2. Did the participants implement new skills?
3. Did the participants implement new skills with fidelity?

Long-Term

4. Did students increase their reading achievement?
5. Are students with specific learning disabilities being placed in the regular environment at a greater rate than before?

A large stakeholder group was formed to provide input on the evaluation plan. Participants include parents, LEA leadership from the six pilot LEAs, IHE representatives, representatives from other state and federal programs at the SEA level, and teacher leader representatives.

The stakeholder group was given opportunities to provide input throughout the development of the evaluation plan. Their input was thoughtfully considered and incorporated into the final evaluation plan. Stakeholder involvement is outlined in greater detail in the infrastructure development section.

Frequent and transparent communication will be the norm. The evaluation process and results will be shared and discussed via four methods:

1. The SEP will have in-person meetings with the six pilot LEAs three times a year.
2. Email and phone will be used frequently to communicate with the six pilot LEAs in between meetings. An "open door" policy will be followed.
3. At least annually, the SEP will provide updates on the SSIP evaluation and seek input from the South Dakota Advisory Panel.
4. At least annually and during the monthly state director phone calls, LEA directors will be informed of the SSIP evaluation and given a chance to provide input.

The SEP has created an evaluation plan that specifies the evaluation measures that will be used for each coherent improvement strategy (see SD SSIP Detailed Evaluation Questions 2015-16.docx and SD SSIP Evaluation Plan 2015-16.docx). The general measures that go across all or most of the four standards of action are:

1. Activity tracking. A website (SDPD) has been developed that tracks each training conducted by the pilot LEAs.
2. End-of-Training Evaluations. The SDPD website has a training evaluation component. Training participants are given a unique URL for each training and complete the evaluation online. The system produces evaluation reports in real-time.
3. Participant Tracking. The SDPD website has a participant tracking component. This allows the SEP to know who participated in each training.
4. Forms that measure whether participants are implementing new skills (e.g., problem-solving checklists and tiered intervention tracking forms).
5. Perception Survey of Skills. These measure participants' perceptions of their skills.
6. 6-Month Follow-Up Surveys. These surveys measure whether participants are implementing learned skills back on the job six months after the training.
7. Fidelity of Implementation Tools. These tools are used by an external observer to measure implementation of new skills.

The coherent improvement strategies are being implemented in six pilot LEAs who represent the entire state. The two largest LEAs in the state are two of the six pilot LEAs. The K-12 enrollments of these six LEAs represent 33% of all enrolled K-12 students. In addition, these six LEAs represent 30% of all students with specific learning disabilities in the state.

To measure the impact of the coherent improvement strategies on student outcomes, the state SSIP core team will be using an interrupted time-series design with comparison group.

- Data on student outcomes (state test data as well as formative, school-based assessment) will be collected and analyzed at defined time periods before and after the intervention.
- Comparable LEAs in the state will be identified to serve as a comparison group for every year of the project.
- In addition, one of the largest pilot LEAs will implement the coherent improvement strategies to one group of schools in year 1, a second group in year 2, and a third group in year 3. This will allow those schools to be on the "waiting list" as a comparison group.

The data will be reviewed quarterly by the state SSIP core team. The data will be reviewed with the pilot LEAs at the end of each school year to determine what worked well and what needs to change.

The state SSIP core team will evaluate the initial effectiveness of the TA/PD through the SDPD website. Because training evaluations are collected immediately after a training, and because reports of results are created in real-time, satisfaction data can be analyzed right away. Pre/post-knowledge tests are collected at the beginning and the end of training, and this data is analyzed in a timely fashion. In addition, the "Observation Checklist for High Quality Professional Development" will be used to assess the training and ensure it includes the necessary components for it to be effective.

The state SSIP core team will be collecting and reviewing data on a regular basis. The state SSIP core team will meet monthly. Data on training activities are collected in real-time, and short-term data (e.g., progress monitoring data, implementation data, and perception data) will be collected throughout the process. Thus, the state SSIP core team will know very quickly if anything (activities, evaluations, communications, etc.) needs to be modified.

Note: The state SSIP core team will be modifying the SIMR targets. The South Dakota state test changed in 2014-2015, and the data from spring 2015 is being analyzed. The state will be establishing new Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). Once summary statistics on students with specific learning disabilities have been produced, a new baseline and targets will be established. Refer to the explaination in the Historical Data and Targets section for a greater explanation and more information regarding South Dakota's baseline and targets.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

The State of South Dakota has faced several barriers such as staffing and funding. Throughout this process, South Dakota appreciates the technical assistance, support, and guidance provided by OSEP and its various technical assistance investments such as NCSI, IDC, etc. We specifically appreciate the qualitative reviews and feedback provided by OSEP and other technical assistance providers and will continue to access those opportunities as this process continues to develop. We will look forward to additional guidance tools developed by OSEP to help us continue the development and implementation of the SSIP.

Phase III submissions should include:

• Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
• Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
• Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

The South Dakota Special Education Programs office (SEP) State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) indicates that students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) will increase reading proficiency prior to fourth grade from 4.84% in spring 2015 to 36.56% by spring 2019 as measured by the statewide assessment. As discussed in Phase I and Phase II, SEP and its stakeholders developed a Theory of Action (see **SDTheoryofActionGraphic2.docx**) that describes four broad Standards of Action as follows:

- Data Analysis
- Instructional Practices and Strategies
- Collaboration; and
- Family and Community Involvement.

SEP and its stakeholders continued to develop and implement SSIP activities, including the evaluation plan, over the course of the year. Five school districts continue to constitute the SSIP implementation group, referred to as the pilot districts. Staff members in each pilot district have received professional development through the Teaching Reading Sourcebook recognized by the National Reading Panel. Additional professional development efforts are centered on coaching, data analysis training, and benchmark assessment tool trainings. SEP, stakeholder groups, and pilot districts validated these practices to be evidence-based, many of which were being implemented by one or more of the pilot districts, enabling the SSIP to leverage current initiatives and strategies.

Beginning with Phase II and continuing through Phase III, pilot districts implemented these evidence-based strategies and trained new staff members in order to help ensure full implementation. As part of the evaluation plan, the five pilot districts provided feedback through the completion of training evaluations, pre- and post- training tests, Problem-Solving Checklist, perception surveys, Team Process Checklist, intervention tracking forms, student benchmark data, and student state test data. A member of the SEP SSIP Core Team attended a training from each of the pilot districts to verify that trainings incorporated the essential elements of high quality training using the Observational Checklist for High Quality Professional Development (see **A4 HQODchecklistfinal.docx**).

The Theory of Action, as well as the Detailed Evaluation Questions document (see **sdssipdetailedevaluationquestions2016-17.pdf**) specifies the short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes of the SSIP. Expected outcomes include teacher acquisition of new knowledge, teachers learning and implementing new skills and strategies, staff engaging in problem-solving processes, general education and special education teachers collaborating, increased family engagement, increased percentages of students with disabilities receiving behavioral support, students being placed in tiered interventions, student achievement improvements, and an increase in the percent of students with disabilities being placed in the regular classroom with typical peers.

Throughout the SSIP Phase III process, SEP engaged stakeholder groups to review the implementation of the SSIP. South Dakota has two main stakeholder groups, the large stakeholder group and the small stakeholder group and the SEP SSIP Core Team. The large stakeholder group includes parents, teachers, parent support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, school district administrators, and other state agencies. The small stakeholder group includes SEP staff and key staff representing the five pilot districts. The SEP SSIP Core Team includes the SEP director, a SEP SSIP Core Team lead designated by the SEP director, and other SEP staff as assigned. SEP has also accessed the support of consultants in order to facilitate stakeholder engagement, develop tools for data analysis and stakeholder input, and design and implement the SSIP evaluation plan.

The large stakeholder group met in October 2016 to review initial results data from the time the five pilot districts began implementing coherent improvement strategies. Initial indications show student performance is improving! The group engaged in discussions regarding improvements in teacher knowledge, skills and fidelity of implementation as well as discussions on baseline data and setting new targets (see **Section C and E** for details).

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

The following is a Phase III Activities Timeline that SEP created to help guide and document key activities. The chart includes the activity, dates, responsible persons, and brief comments documenting key outcomes of the events.

Phase III Activities Timeline 2016-2017 School Year			
Activity	**Deadline**	**Persons Responsible**	**Comments**
Phase II submission	April 1, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team	Completed
Phase III planning meeting	April 12, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team	Completed
Planning for Large Stakeholder Meeting; drafting agenda, purpose and outcomes	May 25, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team	Completed

Meeting to discuss and review Family Engagement tools and framework	May 27, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team and Small Stakeholder group	Completed; identified possible options
Planning meeting to continue preparation for large stakeholder meeting. Completed agenda development and identified meeting process.	May 31, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team Lead	Completed; including agenda development and meeting process
Stakeholder Meeting (Larger group)	June 13, 2016	Large Stakeholder Group	Conducted group collaboration activity; defined what collaboration is for SD SSIP; reviewed and firmed up the evaluation plan; reviewed and discussed possible activities for collaboration and family engagement
SSIP Core Team call to discuss OSEP TA call results; planning and discussion	August 12, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team	Completed; also discussed upcoming data drill down
Meeting with evaluator and SEP Core Team Lead	September 15, 2016	Evaluator and SEP SSIP Core Team Lead	Conducted a review of the data available to date
Follow Up TA call with OSEP contact	September 16, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team	Completed
Planning meeting to discuss baseline/target setting needs	September 22, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team	Discussed baseline and targeting formulas and possible strategy to take to stakeholder group for input and decision
TA call with the small stakeholder group	October 7, 2016	SSIP Core Team and Small Stakeholder group	Discussed the upcoming school year, upcoming stakeholder meeting, phase III evaluation plan, and needed supports.
Large Stakeholder Meeting	October 18, 2016	Large Stakeholder Group	Main outcome was decision on resetting baseline/target for SiMR. Also reviewed some interim student level data for purpose of Phase III progress monitoring
Small Stakeholder Group report on activities related to Family/ Community Engagement	November 4, 2016	Pilot Districts	Districts submitted a report on activities currently being implemented related to Family/ Community Involvement and Collaboration
Follow up TA call with small stakeholder group	November 7, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team and Small Stakeholder group	Districts reported out on areas of concerns and supports needed from the state
Data review meeting	November 9, 2016	SEP SSIP Core Team Lead and Evaluator	Discussed current data on evidence of implementation
Attend NCSI learning Collaborative in Dallas, TX	November 30-December 1, 2016	Selected SEP SSIP Core team staff	Received up to date information and guidance as well as TA on Phase III of SSIP

Additional discussion on progress of implementation: As discussed at the last two large stakeholder group meetings in January and March 2017, interim student-level data demonstrate promising results as SSIP activities were implemented over the course of the past year. Examples of this data are discussed below in Section E – *Progress toward achieving intended improvements*. Other examples of progress in implementation of the SSIP activities include the implementation of professional development (PD) activities as planned in Phase II, such as the Train the Trainer Model PD on the Teaching Reading Sourcebook and on the South Dakota Data Workbook for Reading. The SEP SSIP Core Team Lead then went into the districts to directly observe the training from the Train the Trainer Model and assess the delivery of the training with an eye toward fidelity using the Observational Checklist for High Quality Professional Development.

Another example related to progress of implementation was evident in the pilot district conference calls. The calls in February and March provided information that suggested districts are in fact implementing the trainings as well as implementing data analysis activities as planned out during Phase II. Of note, information from the districts suggested these activities are largely becoming routine and part of the teachers' conversations and regular practices, rather than separate, initiative-driven activities. Pilot districts made the comment that teachers and building leaders understand the data better and how to use it to inform instruction.

SEP continued its collaborative approach to improving the state infrastructure by engaging the large and small stakeholder groups that were involved in Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP. While SEP engaged stakeholders at various levels throughout the year, the department intentionally brought stakeholder workgroups together on four occasions to conduct Phase III evaluation planning meetings and gather stakeholder input. Thirty-four stakeholders were part of the SSIP large stakeholder group and participated in various stages during Phase III of the SSIP. Cross-divisional meetings and data sharing continues to be vital in the analysis of data, infrastructure, future improvement strategies, and measurable results. The key roles included in all stakeholder groups are parents, teachers, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, school district administrators, and other state agencies. Internal stakeholders across the DOE also provided input. As listed below, the stakeholders represent both special and general education perspectives in order to help provide a complete understanding of state infrastructure across all systems.

Stakeholder representation involvement includes:

- Parents
- South Dakota DOE staff across departments (e.g., Special Education, Title 1, Teaching, and Learning, Assessment, and Data)
- South Dakota Advisory Panel on Children with Disabilities
- LEA Special Education Directors
- Other LEA staff invited by the district Special Education Director (e.g., superintendent, directors, and Title 1 directors)
- South Dakota Parent Connection (PTI Center)
- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) state contact
- Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Educators (general and special education teachers)

Phase III SSIP Large Stakeholder Face-to-Face Meeting Dates

Date	Time	Location	Purpose
June 13, 2016	10 am-4 pm	Fort Pierre, SD	Conducted group collaboration activity; defined what collaboration is for the SSIP; reviewed and firmed up the evaluation plan; reviewed and discussed possible activities for collaboration and family engagement
October 18, 2016	10 am-4 pm	Fort Pierre, SD	Main outcome was decision on resetting baseline/target for SiMR. Also reviewed some interim student level data for purpose of Phase III progress monitoring
January 9, 2017	9 am-4 pm	Chamberlain, SD	Districts submitted a report on activities currently being implemented related to Family-Community Involvement and Collaboration
March 8, 2017	10 am-4 pm	Fort Pierre, SD	Reviewed latest OSEP TA guidance; established new target and baseline; reviewed evaluation activities and discussed strategies for family engagement and collaboration

Phase III SSIP Small Stakeholder Conference Call Meeting Dates

Date	Time	Purpose/Outcome
October 7, 2016	10 am-11 am	Discussed the upcoming school year, upcoming stakeholder meeting, Phase III evaluation plan, and needed supports
November 7, 2016	1 pm-2 pm	Districts reported out on areas of concerns and supports needed from the state

February 27, 2017	10 am- 11 am	Discussed upcoming stakeholder meeting, districts reported out on updated SSIP implementations since the October 18, 2016 stakeholder group
March 30, 2017	4:15 pm- 5 pm	Districts reported out on any changes made to infrastructure since receiving data reports at the March 8, 2017 stakeholder group

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

The SD SSIP Logic Model (see **sdssiplogicmodel.pdf**) developed by the SEP SSIP Core Team during Phase II provides details on how each of the four coherent improvement strategies will lead to various short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes. The SD SSIP Detailed Evaluation Plan document (see **SD SSIP Evaluation Plan 2016-17.pdf**) and the SD SSIP Detailed Evaluation Questions 2016-17 document (see **sdssipdetailedevaluationquestions2016-17.pdf**) provides details on the data sources for the key measures used to assess the implementation and outcomes of each coherent improvement strategy.

The general measures that go across all or most of the four standards of action are:

1. Activity tracking. A secure website (South Dakota Professional Development or SDPD) has been developed for tracking each training that is conducted by the pilot districts. The SEP SSIP Core Team and appropriate district staff are given log-in credentials to enter and view workshops and workshop evaluation reports.
2. End-of-Training Evaluations. The SDPD website has a training evaluation component. Training participants are given a unique URL for each training and complete the evaluation online. The system produces evaluation reports in real-time.
3. Participant Tracking. The SDPD website has a participant tracking component. This allows SEP to know who participated in each training.
4. Forms that measure whether participants are implementing new skills (e.g., Problem-Solving Checklists and Tiered Intervention Tracking Forms).
5. Perception Survey of Skills. These measure participants' perceptions of their skills on which they receive training.
6. Fidelity of Implementation Tools. These tools are used by an external observer to measure implementation of new skills.

These measures allow the SEP SSIP Core Team to assess progress towards achieving the intended improvements. The SDPD site allows for the tracking of the trainings and the training evaluations in real-time. The tracking of tiered interventions at three time periods throughout the year also allows for a check on implementation of instructional practices in November, February, and May.

The coherent improvement strategies are being implemented in five pilot districts. The pilot districts are representative of the entire state. These districts represent the western, eastern, and central parts of the state. The two largest districts in the state are two of the pilot districts. The K-12 enrollment of the pilot districts represents 30% of all enrolled K-12 students. In addition, the pilot districts represent 27% of all students with SLD in the state.

To measure the impact of the coherent improvement strategies on student outcomes, the SEP SSIP Core Team will be using an Interrupted time-series design with a comparison group.

- Data on student outcomes (state test data as well as formative school-based assessment) will be collected and analyzed at defined time periods before and after the intervention.
- Comparable LEAs in the state will be identified to serve as a comparison group for all years of the project.
- In addition, one of the largest pilot LEAs is implementing the coherent improvement strategies to one group of schools in year 1, a second group in year 2, and a third group in year 3. This will allow the SEP SSIP Core Team to use the schools with phased in implementation as a comparison group.

The state has regularly reviewed evaluation data as it has become available. Data on outputs, short-term outcomes, and medium-term outcomes are regularly reviewed. The SD SSIP Detailed Evaluation Questions 2016-17 document (see **sdssipdetailedevaluationquestions2016-17.pdf**) shows baseline and current data (where available) on each key measure. See the SD Data Dashboard Report (see **SDDataDashboardReport.pdf**) for a summary of the evaluation measures collected in 2016-17. Some highlights from the data include:

- For both the data analysis and instructional strategies trainings, over 95% of participants indicated that their knowledge and skills increased and that they would change something on their job as a result of the training.
- 100% of participants attending the instructional strategies trainings improved their post-test score on the knowledge test.
- 88% of staff at the pilot districts indicated that they are skilled in various data analysis strategies; and 93% indicated that they are skilled in various instructional strategies.
- Over 75% of participants indicated that the problem solving and team processes were being implemented with fidelity.
- 55% of SLD students at the pilot districts received an intervention; 88% receiving a Tier 2 intervention demonstrated success; 63% receiving a Tier 3 intervention demonstrated success.

The pilot districts are encouraged to review their data from the evaluation measures and make changes in the way in which they are implementing their strategies. Detailed reports on each measure were sent quarterly to each district, and a data dashboard report was generated for each of the pilot districts.

Districts are attentively examining the evaluation data they receive. For example, after seeing the summarized results of the November Intervention Tracking

Form (see **C3 TrackingFormClassReading.xlsx**), some school staff members realized that the students with SLD who were receiving Tier 3 interventions, could in fact be receiving Tier 2 interventions as well. These teachers have since made adjustments to increase exposure of students with SLD to not only intensive interventions in the special education setting but also strategic interventions with nondisabled peers in the general education setting, allowing more time for skill acquisition.

Based on the detailed reports given to districts, another change or adjustment at the district level was an increase in professional development being provided to educators during Phase III. These two examples of adjustments to the SSIP implementation were based on response to data from the SSIP evaluation activities.

One data-based change that was made during Phase III is the SiMR targets. Partially due to leadership turnover and concerns with current capacity for implementation, one of the pilot districts dropped out of the project in 2016-17. Thus, baseline data was modified so it consisted of the five remaining pilot districts' data. In addition, the targets for the SiMR were changed given there are two years of data based on Smarter Balanced, the new state reading test. South Dakota administered the Smarter Balanced assessment in spring 2015 and then again in spring 2016. Based on the new baseline data, challenging targets were set for the SiMR.

Other data besides the state reading test data (e.g., data on the short-term and medium-term outcomes) indicate that SD is on the right track. Benchmark data from the pilot districts show that the percentage of students with SLD scoring at benchmark increased from the fall to spring in 2015-16 for students in grades 2 and 3. Data from 2016-17 will provide data on the reliability and stability of this finding. After the 2016-17 state test data and benchmark data are available, the SEP SSIP Core team will determine if the gains have increased over and above 2015-16. Depending on what the data show, activities will continue as is or adjustments in the improvement strategies will be made either statewide or at select pilot districts.

As specified in Section B., several in-person stakeholder meetings were held. At these meetings, detailed evaluation information was provided to the stakeholders. Stakeholders provided feedback on the evaluation measures and results. The SEP SSIP Core Team Lead held regular conference calls with key staff from the pilot districts to review updates on implementation of the plan, provide TA, and advise on any adjustments or changes that need to be made to the plan. In addition, the pilot districts regularly get reports on the evaluations they complete so that they may make adjustments as necessary in the implementation of their plan.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

In general, the data collected has been of high quality, and the SEP SSIP Core Team has had very few concerns. The most important data for evaluating progress is the state test data and benchmark data. This data is of high quality and is being collected on all students with SLD.

For the two action strands of Data Analysis and Instructional Practices and Strategies, the output, and outcome, and fidelity data are being collected and are of high quality for the second year of implementation (2016-17). During the first year (2015-16), one area of concern surrounding the Instructional Practices and Strategies action strand was collecting intervention tracking data. Staff members in pilot districts were asked to indicate which students with a specific learning disability were receiving a Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention and to provide information on the success of this intervention. Initially, staff members objected in part due to the detailed intervention tracking form they were asked to complete. As such, the data from 2015-16 was limited. Based on stakeholder feedback, the intervention tracking form was revised to be more user friendly. Also, the SEP SSIP Core Team discussed with the pilot districts the value of the data and as such got the pilot districts on board with the intervention tracking form. In fact, in November 2016, pilot districts provided intervention information on 340 students with SLD which represents over 50% of students with a specific learning disability at the targeted schools in the pilot districts.

A current concern relates to the lack of evaluation data being collected on the Collaboration and Family and Community Involvement action strands. For these two strands, the districts were given the flexibility to identify current research based practices and strategies or select research based practices and strategies that would meet the unique needs of the districts. The state provides oversight and monetary support for these activities but allows districts the discretion to select activities targeted to the unique needs of schools. The benefit to this approach is that districts can select and implement those activities that will have the most success given the district's culture, talents, and resources. The disadvantage of this approach is identifying a standard evaluation measure that will work with all the pilot districts and provide meaningful and useful information.

To address this concern, in 2016-17, the SEP SSIP Core Team identified and considered three standardized family engagement measures and presented them to the large stakeholder group. Initial discussion resulted in consensus that further planning is needed and would occur as a next step. The SEP SSIP Core Team will obtain input from the large stakeholder group to select, finalize, and implement a strategy for measuring family engagement for implementation by Fall of 2017. These evaluation measures (a qualitative analysis of district family engagement activities; a family engagement survey for parents of students with SLD, and a family engagement implementation checklist) will provide the SEP SSIP Core Team with valuable information from district parents and staff members regarding the impact of family engagement activities in the district.

The SEP SSIP Core Team is currently developing similar types of evaluation measures for the Collaboration action strand that will be implemented in the 2017-18 school year. The qualitative analysis of district collaboration activities will take place prior to the 2017-18 school year. Other measures such as a staff survey on the degree of collaboration and fidelity of implementation measure of collaboration will be developed in summer 2017.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Several evaluation measures address the issue of fidelity of implementation. For the Data Analysis action strand, the SEP SSIP Core Team collected data on several components surrounding the data analysis process that schools are to engage in after the data analysis training. These include the Team Process Checklist; the Problem-Solving Checklist for Core/Universal Screening; and the Problem-Solving Checklist for Individual Students. These data show:

- 90% of participants completing the Team Process Checklist indicate that the team is engaging in effective team practices.
- 94% of participants completing the Problem-Solving Checklist for Core/Universal Screening indicate that this Tier 1 review is being implemented with fidelity.

- 79% of participants completing the Problem-Solving Checklist for Individual Students indicate that the Tier 2 initial review is being implemented with fidelity; and 89% indicate that the Tier 2 follow-up review is being implemented with fidelity.

For the Instructional Practices and Strategies action strand, the Intervention Tracking form (see **C3 TrackingFormClassReading.xlsx**) and the Observational Checklist (see **A4 HQODchecklistfinal.docx**) address the fidelity of implementation question. Data are being collected in spring 2017 on these measures. November 2016 data from the Intervention Tracking Form showed that 340 students with SLD were getting a Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention. This demonstrates that students are being placed in tiers. Intervention Tracking data was collected again in February 2017 and will be collected in May 2017 to determine if interventions changed for those students who were not making progress in November. February data are currently being analyzed. The analysis of the November Intervention Tracking data suggest that teachers are implementing the strategies they were taught. However, more direct fidelity of implementation data will be collected with the Observational Checklist. This checklist measures the extent to which teachers who have been trained on the Core Reading program are implementing what they were taught. This checklist will be completed on a sample of teachers from each of the pilot districts by trained observers. The trained observers will include state staff and district staff who are familiar with the Instructional Strategies action strand.

Attached are two data charts, Display 1 and Display 2 (see **DataDisplays1and2.pdf**). Display 1 shows the progress on the SiMR. From spring 2015 to spring 2016 the percentage of students with a specific learning disability scoring proficient on the 3rd grade state reading test increased by almost 2.5 percentage points. While the spring 2016 target was not met, the proficiency rate did increase. Display 2 shows the percentage of students with a specific learning disability meeting benchmark in the fall of 2015 and in the fall of 2016. This data shows that the percentage of grade 2 and 3 students meeting benchmark increased from fall to spring, but the percentage of students in grades K and 1 meeting benchmark did not increase from fall to spring. When this information was shared with the pilot districts, district staff indicated that the reason is the grade K and 1 test in the fall is very different from that in the spring and tests different skills. The SD SSIP Core Team will continue to evaluate this data for all grades to determine if changes in improvement strategies need to take place for students in grades K and 1 as well as grades 2 and 3 to increase the percentage of students meeting benchmark (see **DataDisplays1and2.pdf**).

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Moving into the next year, the SEP SSIP Core Team and pilot districts will continue to meet on a regular basis to assess implementation efforts. This will include at least three face-to-face meetings and at least four virtual conference calls. The SEP SSIP Core Team Lead will schedule on-site visits with each of the pilot districts to determine implementation information (including fidelity), assess any technical assistance or professional development needs, and provide direct support to key district personnel.

Phase III SSIP Large Stakeholder Face-to-Face Meeting Activities

Date	Location	Purpose
June 2017	Fort Pierre, SD	SSIP Data Analysis Discussion and Infrastructure Changes Family and Community Involvement Teaching Reading Sourcebook Training Next Steps Collaboration
October 2017	Fort Pierre, SD	SSIP Data Analysis Discussion and Infrastructure Changes Implementation Discussion
February 2018	Fort Pierre, SD	SSIP Data Analysis Discussion and Infrastructure Changes Looking at Targets Discussion on APR submission for Indicator 17

Phase III SSIP Small Stakeholder Group Conference Calls

Date	Purpose
May 2017	TA and Support
August 2017	TA and Support
November 2017	TA and Support
March 2018	TA and Support

The evaluation plan (as outlined in the detailed evaluation questions document) will continue on schedule. In 2017-18, observational checklists and other fidelity of implementation measures will be developed and used. Evaluation measures focusing on collaboration and family engagement will also be developed and used.

There are several anticipated barriers the SEP SSIP Core Team and stakeholders will consider as the state continues its efforts to fully implement and evaluate the SSIP activities. Some barriers include teacher scheduling, teacher commitment to SSIP efforts, and transfer of professional development skills to

the classroom. While districts understand the importance of offering professional development to ensure that educators continue to strengthen practices and skills, finding the time to pull teachers out of the classroom has been a challenge. Districts have to use a variety of schedules to provide this collaborative learning and work time for teachers. Time to provide professional development to all staff is limited due to local school district and building level policy and demands on teacher time. These factors result in a negative impact on the number of hours available to apply interventions. Educator shortages in SD also make this a challenge. Substitute shortages prevent professional development training to occur during school hours. Administrators struggle to fill day-to-day teacher absences with an adequate number of substitutes. Being a rural state, personnel resources are limited, particularly staff that are trained to deliver the Teaching Reading Sourcebook training. This said, districts strive to reach maximum efficacy with training opportunities resulting in positive outcomes from PD experiences.

Secondly, teacher buy-in to implement SSIP related activities continues to be an area to work on. The SEP SSIP Core Team, including DOE leadership has worked alongside district Special Education Directors in the pilot districts to make the implementation of initiatives and evaluation activities part of districts/teachers daily routines. Pilot districts have reported that authentic efforts have been made by building teams and classroom level staff to implement SSIP related activities over the course of Phase III, and these efforts have begun to take on a routine nature about them, indicating higher levels of staff buy-in. As trainers and building leadership develop relationships with staff and are able to demonstrate positive outcomes as a result of implementing SSIP related strategies, staff have taken more ownership and are more committed to the plan.

Lastly, SD has been working with IHEs to strengthen teacher preparation systems to ensure transfer of pedagogy and instructional skills to the classroom. Teacher preparation systems have been responding vigorously to the increased demand for teachers in the State of South Dakota. New teacher licensure standards have been approved to ensure that teacher preparation systems meet both the teaching requirements of schools and the learning needs of students. To ensure high quality PD is available to all teachers particularly in rural and small districts, SEP has partnered with IHEs through the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) grant to offer online modules focusing on Features of Effective Instruction. The Division of Learning and Instruction has implemented a Statewide Mentoring Program, which includes special education teachers. The mentoring program supplies specific and targeted support to new teachers by providing access to a mentor. New teachers are paired with an experienced teacher in order to enhance teaching quality, improve retention which will result in a boost to student achievement. Another positive aspect of the mentoring program is that all new teachers that apply are accepted into the program and paired with a mentor.

SEP will continue to take steps to leverage existing efforts to achieve higher outcomes for all students. SEP will continue to work with the pilot districts to maximize time and effectiveness of trainings through the development of a fidelity checklist and through the collection of interim short term data in order to making adjustments to infrastructure needs. SEP expects data to demonstrate that when teachers acquire evidenced-based reading instructional skills, student performance will increase

South Dakota has effective statewide technical assistance structures. These structures include:

- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) including Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (RtI). RtI is an effective program because it is a systems approach, a general education and special education initiative, focuses on prevention, collaborative-team oriented process, and is a process that relies on strong core instruction. PBIS addresses behavior and social needs of all students.
- A culture of data-driven decision making within the South Dakota Department of Education through the longitudinal data system (SDStars).
- Supports to Title I buildings through MTSS and School Support Team (SST) collaboration for Focus and Priority Schools.

Additional supports needed continue to include federal technical assistance in the form of sharing out what other states are doing to mitigate common barriers to implementation; providing clear guidance on expectations regarding implementation of SSIP activities with fidelity; and helping build knowledge and capacity for literacy strategies and implementation.

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Linda Turner

Title: Special Education Programs Director

Email: linda.turner@state.sd.us

Phone: 605-773-3327